

! mph.
K. land.
Gram.
H.

THE
NEGATIVE COMPOUNDS
IN GREEK.

A DISSERTATION

PRESENTED TO THE BOARD OF UNIVERSITY STUDIES
OF THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY

HOLLISTER ADELBERT HAMILTON,
PROFESSOR OF GREEK IN ELMIRA COLLEGE.

BALTIMORE

1899



THE
NEGATIVE COMPOUNDS
IN GREEK.

A DISSERTATION

PRESENTED TO THE BOARD OF UNIVERSITY STUDIES
OF THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY

HOLLISTER ADELBERT HAMILTON,
PROFESSOR OF GREEK IN ELMIRA COLLEGE.

BALTIMORE

1899

JOHN MURPHY COMPANY, PRINTERS,
BALTIMORE.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
I. INTRODUCTORY, - - - - -	5
II. THE FORM OF THE PREFIX, - - - - -	6
The term <i>alpha-privative</i> .—Suggestion as to its possible origin.— The Indo-European negatives.—Accent.—The form of the prefix in Greek, lengthening of it, à- before vowels, the forms νη- and ἀγα.	
III. THE FORM AND CLASSIFICATION OF THE COMPOUNDS, - - - - -	15
IV. THE LIMITATIONS ON THE USE OF THE PREFIX IN COMPOSITION, The original sphere of the prefix,—Its use with the partici- ple,—with the infinitive,—with the finite verb,—with nouns in immutata,—with adjectives.	17
V. THE FAVORITE TYPES OF NEGATIVE COMPOUNDS, - - - - -	27
The compounds with the verbals in -τος.—The mutata of α- privative + noun.	
VI. EXPRESSIONS WHICH MAY REPLACE THE NEGATIVE COMPOUNDS, Use of the sentence-negative,—of δυσ- and κακο-,—of preposi- tions in composition,—of certain verb-stems,—of certain adjective-stems.—Substitutes for the derivatives.	29
VII. THE SEMASIOLOGY OF THE NEGATIVE COMPOUNDS, - - - - -	35
Development from original free negative to the negative in composition.—Negative and contrary significations, thence a positive content.—Prefix with the force of a sentence- negative.—Privation and negation.—Hyperbole.	
VIII. THE NEGATIVE COMPOUNDS AS AN ELEMENT OF STYLE, - - - - -	41
Stylistic character of compounds in general.—The artistic and technical spheres.—Stylistic effects of the negative com- pounds.—Massing of them together, alliteration, anaphora,— feeling in privation,—triplets.—Figura etymologica.—Oxy- moron.—The proportional metaphor.—Antithesis.—Litotes. —Extension in form for phonetic impressiveness.	
IX. HISTORY OF THE FORMATION OF THE NEGATIVE COMPOUNDS IN GREEK, - - - - -	53
Compounds possibly inherited from the proethnic speech.— Tables showing emergence of the compounds in the litera- ture.—Contributions of different portions of the literature to the number of negative compounds.—The various classes of negative words,—à-privative + adjective,—growth of com- pounds with verbals in -τος at the expense of the mutata,— derivatives, especially the abstract nouns.—The νη- com- pounds.	

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2010 with funding from
University of Toronto

THE NEGATIVE COMPOUNDS IN GREEK.

I. INTRODUCTORY.

The study of the negative compounds in Greek may afford a single chapter in the history of noun-composition in that language, a subject which has not yet received a comprehensive treatment, nor one which is commensurate with its importance in more than one department of philology. The compounds of alpha-privative make one of the largest groups and one of the simplest types of composite word-formation and the investigation has a varied interest as we may approach our task from the formal, the semantic, the stylistic, or the historical side. Thus we may consider first the forms in which the negative prefix appears, the restrictions of its use in composition, and the types of compounds which are formed by it. Again, the semasiological character of these compounds claims attention, both as to the various shades of negative conceptions and relations which they may express and as to the part which they play in comparison with other means which the language possesses for negative expression. In the third place the employment of these compounds has a stylistic importance, especially where they appear massed together, where they belong to certain poetic or technical spheres, or where they are used as the vehicles of certain figurative forms of expression. Finally, we have to give some account of the history of the formation and use of the negative compounds in the various departments of the literature and through the different periods of the language.

II. THE FORM OF THE PREFIX.

The regular and productive form of the negative prefix in Greek is the so-called *a*-privative (*ἄλφα στερητικόν*). The negative prefix *vñ-* is archaic and poetic and can hardly be said to be productive in any period of the language.

Philologists now-a-days are wont to speak of the *so-called* alpha-privative, and this is because that designation is misleading in both its parts. For in the first place the ante-vocalic form *āv-* undoubtedly represents more nearly the original form of the prefix than does the ante-consonantal *ā-*, and it is the nasal which is its characteristic element and which is still common to most of its forms in the various languages cognate with Greek; cf. Lat. *in-*, Germ. *un-*, etc. The origin of the term *alpha*-privative is doubtless due partly to the fact that in the great majority of cases the prefix stands before a consonant, and so appears as *ā-* rather than *āv-*, and partly to the accepted view of the ancients and of earlier modern scholars that the *v* was inserted after the *ā* for the avoidance of hiatus. Secondly, the meaning of the prefix is by no means merely privative, i. e. denoting the removal of that which was before possessed or the absence of that which is aimed at or expected, but it is rather negative in the widest sense, running the whole gamut of possible shades of negation. A more proper designation, therefore, would be *āv-negative*, which, however, in deference to established usage we shall not venture to employ.

A comparison of the forms in the extant languages of the Indo-European family points unmistakably towards the use of a nasal element as a negative sign in the pro-ethnic speech. We are able to discern also that the early language differentiated the negative of the sentence from the negative which formed a close compound with a noun, an adjective, or an adverb. We can tell too the classes of compounds into which in this early period the latter form of the negative entered. If we attempt to go further back than this, we can no longer speak of scientific knowledge, but must be content to ascribe to our surmises merely the character of *a priori* probability or possibility.

Perhaps without claiming for the fancy any more than it is

worth we may be permitted to indulge in a conjecture as to one of the possible ways in which the use of a nasal element as a negative sign may have originated. We must assume that the growth of language has always been, as we see it now, a process of adaptation of means to end. The end was and is the practical one of communicating thought to one's fellows; the means anything which by association can effect the desired communication, whether it be some spoken symbol originating in onomatopoeia, or interjection, or gesture, or what not.

The earliest definite oral expression of negation by the child would naturally often occur with reference to its chief object of interest, its food. Now the refusal of food by one who has not yet mastered articulate speech requires a closed mouth; so, if this be accompanied, as it is apt to be, by vocal utterance, a nasal is produced, generally the labial or dental nasal. The child's negative is thus a 'vocal gesture,' or an interjection. A similar explanation might account for the origin of shaking the head or throwing out the hands sidewise as signs of negation. Languages widely separated and outside of the Indo-European family also have what we may call a nasal negative, e. g. in the American languages, Pokoman, Quichl, Maya, Haytian, Gvajiro, *ma*; Paez, *me*; Kechua, *mana*; Hidatsa, *desa* (*d* being interchangeable with *n*); cf. Douay, *Études Etymologiques sur l'Antiquité Américaine*, Paris, 1891, p. 24. Note too the use of *m* in the negative verb in Turkish.

At any rate, whatever knowledge or theory we can hope to have about the form of the negative in the glottogonic period of speech must be reached by some such method, i. e. by studying the modern phenomena which are observed either in the infancy of the individual or in incipient stages in the development of linguistic processes. In some such way as we have indicated, or indeed in any one of various other ways, a negative sign might arise, as the act expressing the negation became less and less instinctive and more and more conventional; and only by degrees would the accompanying sound become an articulate word with a definite place in the sentence. Cf. Paul, *Principles of Language* (Eng. trans.), p. 122, "One might very well imagine that negative sentences might be formed in a primitive stage of development of language

in which the negative sense might be indicated by nothing else than the stress and the accompanying gestures."

But in these matters the only safe attitude is that of an agnostic. Such an attitude we must bear also toward the theory of the origin of the negatives from a demonstrative root. This theory would identify the original form of the negative with the pronominal *ana*, meaning at first 'yonder,' then 'other,' and gradually acquiring a purely negative force; cf. Pott, E. F.², I, p. 382.

ne, *nē*, *no*, *nō*, $\overset{\circ}{n}$ - ($^{\circ}n$), \bar{n} - have been assumed as the forms in which the negative appeared in the primitive Indo-European language. Cf. Fowler, *The Negatives of the Indo-European Languages*, Chicago, 1896, p. 1. There is wide difference in the character and weight of the evidence for the existence of each of these various forms, but it is at least clear, as has been stated, that even in the pro-ethnic speech there was a differentiation between the negative of the verb or of the sentence and that of the noun. Of these forms, if all were in existence, I-E. *ne*, *nē*, *no*, *nō* belonged to the verb or to the sentence, and $\overset{\circ}{n}$ - ($^{\circ}n$), \bar{n} - to the noun (including the adjective). The difference between $\overset{\circ}{n}$ -, $\overset{\circ}{nn}$ - and \bar{n} - is purely one of form, not of meaning; cf. Krużewski, Techmer's *Zeitschrift*, III, p. 185, who says that "prefixes have so definite a meaning that phonetic variations could not be used for any internal distinction in signification." So too, as there is only one kind of negation known to logic, the different forms of the I-E. negative must be thought of as having originated through different accentual relations due to their position in the sentence and not as expressing degrees or varieties of negative force. That the heavier forms should have been used for the negative of the sentence is probably due to the enclisis of the verb. The natural and common view is to regard the negative prefix as a weak ablaut form of the stronger particle. Bopp's identification (Vgl. Gram., § 537) of the *a-* privative with the verbal augment is now nothing more than one of the curiosities of the history of philology; cf. Pott, E. F.², II, p. 398.

This weaker form of the negative which appears in the privative prefix must go back to conditions in which the negative was without accent. Yet secondary causes operating in pro-ethnic times

seemed to have caused the prefix to be accented in primary composition, i. e. in *immutata* (descriptives, *karmadhāraya*). In secondary composition the *mutata* (possessives, *bahuvrīhi*) seem to have largely lost this accent (on the prefix) of the *immutata* from which they were derived and to have become oxytone. See Knauer, Ueber die Betonung der Composita mit a-privatum in Sanskrit, K. Z. xxvi, pp. 65 ff. In the case of *mutata* with stems ending in -es this loss would seem to go back to the pro-ethnic speech; in the case of the other *mutata* the loss, where it has occurred, belongs only to the individual languages. Thus it has become a general rule for *mutata* of all types in Sanskrit, while in Greek it has not gone beyond the stems in -es. See Streitberg, I-G. Forschungen, I, pp. 87 f., 94.

For Greek it may be stated as a general rule that, with the exception of the stems in -es and a few minor groups, the accent is generally recessive in compounds with the negative prefix, both *immutata* and *mutata*, though we can hardly tell whether this is due to the general recessive law or to the tendency to accent the first members of these compounds. *Mutata* in -es (nom. -ης) are with few exceptions oxytone.

This theory, that the oxytonesis of the Greek *mutata* in -ης is a remnant of an old *bahuvrīhi* (*mutatum*) accent the tendency toward which started before the separation of the languages, is that of Knauer, who holds that this tendency was limited by other tendencies in Greek to the *mutata* in -ης, while in Sanskrit it became a rule for *mutata* in general. But the view has also been held that the peculiar accent of the compounds is due to a tendency to take an accent like that of the simple adjectives in -ης; cf. Schroeder, K. Z., xxiv, p. 110, and Wheeler, Der Griechische Nominalaccent, p. 46, n. 1.

While the other languages of the I-E. family have preserved the nasal in their representatives of the I-E. negative prefix *n-* (^o*n*) as in Lat. *in-*, Germ. *un-*, Old Ir. *an-*, the Greek agrees with the Sanskrit and Avestan in having the privative prefix in the form of *ān-* (*an-*) before vowels and of *ā-* (*a-*) before consonants. In Greek there are a few apparent exceptions to this rule. So for ἀνέφελος, Od. 6, 45, some codices read ἀννέφελος; cf. ἄλλοφος, Il.

10,258 (v. l. *ἄλοφος*). There are a number of other phenomena in the Homeric poems which seem to favor the view that these forms may be due largely to metrical necessity in the hexameter. We have *ā-* regularly through the language in *ἀθάνατος*, which is doubtless a very old word and by far the most common of the privative compounds in early Greek poetry, constituting more than one-seventh of all the occurrences in Homer and just one-fourth of those in Hesiod. So we have *ā-* in *ἀκάματος* in dactylic poetry and later *ἀπάλαμος* (Hes.) and *ἀπαράμυθος* (Aesch.). The otherwise constant habit of the language rather forbids us to call these cases of compensatory lengthening for the loss of the *v* of the prefix, but it is more likely that we have here to do with a phenomenon parallel with *ἡνεμόεις* from *ἀνεμος*, *ἀνώνυμος* from *ὄνομα*, the result of a tendency toward the lengthening of short vowels of which the epic poet availed himself under stress of metrical necessity, just as he used always *ἀπτόλεμος* for the unmetered *ἀπόλεμος*. For the rare lengthening of *a*-privative in Sanskrit, see Whitney, Sanskrit Grammar, 1121 c.

The word *ἡκέστος* [= ‘untouched by the goad’ (?)] is found only in the Homeric line, *ἥνις ἡκέστας ἴερεύσεμεν, αὐλ' κ' ἐλεήσῃς*, Il. 6, 94, 275, 309. If we have really to do with the negative prefix here, it may be said that the phrase, *ἥνις ἡκέστας* was probably a crystallized expression and that the metre requires the word in question to be scanned — — —; *η* for *ā* may be dialectic, the consciousness of the relation to *ā*-privative being lost, and the alliteration may have had some influence. But *ā*-privative appears nowhere else in Homer as *η* and the signification of the word as given in the lexica rests apparently on the ancient explanation of it as = *ἀκέντητος*. For a discussion of the word see Froehde, Bezz. Beitr. VII, 328.

Uncertain too is the presence of the negative prefix in *ἀμφασίη* in Il. 17, 695, Od. 4, 704, where there is, however, some manuscript tradition supporting *ἀφασίη*. Pott, E. F.², p. 390 suggested a confusion in *ἀμφασίη* between the negative prefix and *ἀνά* or *ἀμφί*. Froehde, Bezz. Beitr. XX, p. 212, thinks the analogy of *ἀμβροτός* by the side of *βροτός* may have influenced *ἀμφασίη*, while Brugmann, Vgl. Gram.² I, p. 419, refers this form of the

prefix to I-E. \bar{n} . I am indebted to Prof. Dr. Hermann Collitz for the suggestion that the proper division of the word may be $\acute{\alpha}\mu\phi\text{-}a\sigma\acute{\iota}\eta$ and that we may here have to do with the root *as*, *asd*, to parch or wither, and so the word may be cognate with Gk. $\acute{\alpha}\xi\alpha$, $\acute{\alpha}\xi\omega$, $\acute{\alpha}\xi\alpha\acute{\iota}\omega$, $\acute{\alpha}\xi\alpha\acute{\iota}\epsilon\omega$, Lat. *arēre*, *ardēre*, *ardor* (for *asdor*), Eng. ashes. Cf. Fick, Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der I-G. Sprachen,³ II, p. 28.

With regard to the appearance of the form $\acute{a}\text{-}$ before vowels it may be remarked that words like $\acute{\alpha}\acute{u}\pi\nu\omega\varsigma$ (Hom.) and $\acute{\alpha}\acute{o}\iota\kappa\omega\varsigma$ (Hes.) were formed in a period when initial σ and F still existed in the simple words; in some cases the same compounds took $\acute{a}v\text{-}$ later when the traces of the original initial consonant had entirely disappeared, e. g. $\acute{\alpha}\acute{u}\o\iota\kappa\omega\varsigma$ (Hdt.), $\acute{\alpha}\acute{u}\nu\pi\nu\omega\varsigma$ (Byz.); but $\acute{\alpha}\acute{o}\u03c1\tau\omega\varsigma$ and $\acute{\alpha}\acute{n}\acute{o}\u03c1\tau\omega\varsigma$ are both Homeric. $\acute{\alpha}\acute{n}\acute{e}\sigma\iota\tau\omega\varsigma$ and $\acute{\alpha}\acute{n}\acute{e}\iota\mu\omega\varsigma$ are found in Homer, but perhaps only in the later parts; the latter word is found only in the Odyssey. $\acute{\alpha}\acute{a}\alpha\tau\omega\varsigma$ and $\acute{\alpha}\acute{a}\sigma\chi\chi\tau\omega\varsigma$ are of doubtful explanation. The true exceptions to the rule, such as $\acute{\alpha}\acute{o}\rho\nu\omega\varsigma$, $\acute{\alpha}\acute{o}\sigma\mu\omega\varsigma$, mostly with the prefix before *o*, *ω*, are doubtless due to the analogy of the earlier and authorized cases; but most of these have also forms with $\acute{a}v\text{-}$. The differentiation of form before vowels and consonants is perhaps Indo-European, as the agreement of Sanskrit and Greek would seem to show, although in other languages we find the same form for both cases, as in Lat. *in-*, Germ. *un-*.

The proof for the existence of \bar{n} as an I-E. negative prefix is not nearly so abundant as is that for the existence of the shorter forms. Schulze, K. Z. xxvii, p. 606, accepts the equation: Greek $\nu\bar{a}\text{-}$, $\nu\eta\text{-}$ = I-E. \bar{n} , and correlates these with Italic *an-*; in fact he gives the proportion, Lat. *in-* : Ital. *an-* = Gk. $\acute{\alpha}\rho\text{-}$: $\nu\eta\text{-}$; while Kretschmer, K. Z. xxxi, pp. 405, 412, puts Greek $\nu\bar{a}\text{-}$, $\nu\eta\text{-}$ = I-E. $*n\bar{a}\text{-}$ and denies the necessity of positing a long *nasalis sonans* for the parent speech. Persson, I-G. Forsch. II, p. 228, puts Greek $\nu\bar{a}\text{-}$, $\nu\eta\text{-}$ in relation with Lat. *nē*.

The matter is further obscured by formal difficulties. $\nu\eta\text{-}$ actually does appear as a negative prefix in epic, as in $\nu\bar{\eta}\bar{\iota}\bar{\varsigma}$, $\nu\eta\kappa\epsilon\delta\bar{\iota}\bar{\varsigma}$, $\nu\eta\pi\epsilon\eta\theta\bar{\iota}\bar{\varsigma}$ and $\nu\bar{\eta}\kappa\epsilon\bar{\rho}\bar{\sigma}\bar{\omega}\varsigma$. With regard to this prefix $\nu\eta\text{-}$ let us consider the following possibilities: (1) that $\nu\eta\text{-}$ may represent \bar{n} used as a negative prefix in I-E. times, (2) that it represents the I-E.

sentence negative *nē* or *ne*, and (3) that it arose on Greek ground but is to be derived from the I-E. prefix $\bar{\eta}$ ($^e n$).

(1). Certainly there is something to be said in favor of the correlation of Greek *vā-*, *vη-* with an I-E. $\bar{\eta}$. For those who assume $\bar{\eta}$ as an I-E. sound find its regular representative in Skr. \bar{a} and Gk. *vā*; thus the aforementioned rare lengthening of a- privative in Sanskrit would be parallel to Greek *vā-*, *vη-*. In the second place I-E. $\bar{\eta}$ is assumed to result frequently from the reduction of a dissyllabic root. Thus from I-E. * $\sqrt{g}ene$ we have the proportion, I-E. **genetor*: * $\bar{g}\bar{\eta}-tos$ = Skr. *janitar*: *jātāś* = Lat. *genitor*: *gnātus* = Gk. *γενέτωρ* (second ε irregular) : *γηντος* in *κασίγνητος*. This suggests a possible correlation of *vη-* with the troublesome *āva-* of *ἀνάεδνος* (Hom.), *ἀνάελπτος* (Hes.), and the less certain *ἀνάγνωστος* (Callim.), *ἀνάπνευστος* (Hes.). Cf. *θάνατος*, *θηνητός*, etc. We should expect, however, *ēva* rather than *āva*, and it is more convincing to explain these forms of the prefix otherwise. Cf. p. 14, where the existence of *āva-* as a simple form of the negative prefix is shown to be improbable and this taken in connection with the doubtful character of $\bar{\eta}$ as an I-E. sound renders very unsatisfying the assumption of any such origin for the prefix *vη-*.

(2). From what is said hereafter showing the frequent use of the Greek sentence negative as a substitute for the negative prefix, it may not be thought improbable that the Greek *vη-* may represent the I-E. sentence negative *nē* or even *ne* + a following initial vowel. Cf. Hartung, Gr. Part. II, pp. 89 ff. *nē* in Lithuanian and *ne* in Old Bulgarian are used as negative prefixes, and see Leo Meyer, Vgl. Gram.², pp. 119, 594. This theory, that *vη-* is a survival of the I-E. sentence negative, *nē*, *ne*, is somewhat favored by the very restricted scope of this prefix, for *nē*, *ne* were otherwise practically lost in Greek. One may cite *vή* as used in oaths and *vai*, perhaps originally negative. *νέκταρ* seems to be a Semitic loan-word and *νέποδες* and *νεβρός* have a different etymology, cf. Fowler, op. cit. p. 11. The use of *vη-* as a prefix is confined to a few poetic words nearly all archaic or evident archaic imitations. Only about 50 compounds and derivative words appar-

ently having this prefix are quotable; of these only one appears first in Attic prose, and this is *νηποιεί*, Andoc., after Homeric *νήπουνος*. But aside from these words there is no example of the survival of this I-E. sentence negative in Greek as a prefix or otherwise, and to explain *νωδός*, *νώδυνος*, *νώνυμος* on this basis we should have to assume an I-E. *nō* to have survived in Greek; which is very doubtful in any case.

(3). In *νῆστις* (*νέδ-*), *νήνεμος*, *νημερτής*, *νηλεής*, *νήκουστος*, *νήκεστος*, *νήριθμος*, *νήγρετος*, and also *νώνυμος* the prefix *νη-*, if such was its early form, has not been kept pure. Further, most of these forms have by their side forms like *ἀνηστις*, *ἀνήνεμος*, *ἀνηλεής*, *ἀνήκουστος*, *ἀνήκεστος*, *ἀνήριθμος*, *ἀνώνυμος*. Clemm's suggestion, Curt. Stud. VIII, 14, that we have in these last forms an instrumental *ἀνη-*, from which *νη-* results by aphaeresis, would hardly now be regarded as tenable, but his alternative suggestion, that "they have undergone the same prolongation which is wont for metrical reasons to be found in other words," has more of plausibility. There are other Homeric forms like *ἀνήμελκτος*, *ἀνήνυστος*, *ἀνήροτος*, *ἀνήνορα*, which have no forms in *νη-* by their side, but the existence of so many doublets like *ἀνήνεμος*, *νήνεμος*, make it natural to infer an identity of origin for *ἀν-* and *ν-*. The words in question are all very old words and it would appear that in one stage of the language there was a tendency to represent the I-E. prefix before long vowels by *ν-*. It was natural that later this should succumb before the far more common ante-vocalic *ἀν-*.

From words like *νήνεμος*, *νημερτής*, etc., it would be easy to account for the development of a suffix *νη-* by 'clipping,' whence *νῆς*, *νηκερδής*, *νηπενθής*, etc. This seems to us more convincing than Pott's idea that a form like *ἀνηλεής* might be due to a confusion of *ἀν-* and *νη-*, and so be a sort of syncretism of *ἀνελεής* and *νηλεής*.

The attempts at explaining what appears to be a fix *ἀνα-* in the words *ἀνάεδνος*, *ἀνάελπτος*, *ἀνάγνωστος*, *ἀνάπνευστος*, already cited p. 12, have been many and various. The last two of these words, being late, have been explained as analogical formations; cf. Froehde, Bezz. Beitr. xx, p. 212. Schneider, however, changes *ἀνάγνωστον* with some probability to *ἀν ἄγνωστον*, where

it occurs in Callimachus, fr. 422, and *ἀνάπνευστος* in Hes. Th. 797 was changed by Hartung, Gr. Part. II, p. 75, to *ἄρ' ἀπνευστός* (cf. Od. 5, 456) and by Hermann, Opusc. VI, p. 164, to *ἄμ' ἀπνευστός*. Joh. Schmidt, K. Z. XXIII, p. 271 ff., would explain the second vowel in the first two of the forms mentioned above (*ἀνάεδνος*, *ἀνάελπτος*) as developed from the lost *F* (cf. Hartung, l. c.), but in the other forms as due to the following double consonant in the effort to avoid three successive consonants. Thus the second *a* would be only a *svarabhakti* or parasitic vowel. This explanation, however, would assume the existence of a form *ἀν-* before consonants, otherwise supported only by the Homeric *ἀμφασίη*, which has been differently explained above.

The occurrence of a dissyllabic form of the prefix has been asserted too for other languages besides Greek. Pischel, Bezz. Beitr. III, p. 245, remarks on the extended use of *ana-* on Indian ground, and on the strength of Indian *ana-*, Old Bactrian *ana-*, Celtic *ana-*, Greek *ἀνα-*, Old High Germ., *una-*, he assumes *ana-* as the I-E. basic form, as already Buttmann, Gram. II, § 120, anm. 1, and Olafsky (see Neue Jahrb. f. Cl. Phil. u. Paed. LXXIV, p. 581). This assumed basic form has been identified with the pronominal stem, *ana*, Pott. E. F.², I, p. 384, or again with the prepositional *ana* = *ἀνά*, Johansson, Bezz. Beitr. XV, p. 310. Pott would explain the prefix *an-* and the adverb *na* as arising from *ana* under different accentual conditions, thus, *án(a)-*, *(a)ná-*.

But it seems needless to argue for *ana-* as the original I-E. basic form of the prefix, for at any rate this cannot have been the only form just previous to the separation of the individual languages. Otherwise it is difficult to explain, first, the form *a-*, common to Aryan and Greek, and secondly, the very limited scope in Greek of the prefix *ἀνα-*, if such there be. It is likely that the dissyllabic forms of the prefix arose during the separate development of the languages in which they occur. For the independent origin of *ana-* in Celtic before consonants see Zimmer, K. Z. XXIV, p. 524.

It seems probable then that the forms with initial *ἀνα-* are a secondary development within the Greek language. It is not necessary that the same explanation should hold for all cases. In some instances the apparent prefix *ἀνα-* may be due to 'clipping';

thus Froehde, Bezz. Beitr. xx, p. 213, assumes ἀνάεδνος to be for *ἀν-* + *ἀεδνος. Now we have in Homer the simple word in two forms, ἔδνα, ἔεδνα, and Hesychius glosses ἄεδνον by ἄφερνον ή πολύφερνον. If the ancient lexicographer really understood the word, the second *ἀ* in ἀνάεδνος was either negative or intensive. The suggestion of Wharton, Trans. Philol. Soc., 1891–4, p. 331, that *ἀν-* in these words = *n-* and is intensive, so that ἀνάεδνος means ‘quite dowerless,’ would presuppose a double prefix here *n-n-*, of which the first part would be intensive and the other negative.

The view of Pott, E. F.², I, p. 389, that we have in ἀνάεδνος a doubling of the negative prefix seems more probable. Cf. δυσάμμορος, Il. xxii, 428, where the scholiast remarks, δυσάμμορος, δεδιπλασίακε πρὸς τὴν ἐπίτασιν · τὸ γὰρ δυσ καὶ α ταυτὸν δηλοῦσιν; also Et. Mag. sub voc., δυσάμμορος, ὡς ἥλικες, ὁμήλικες, καὶ συνομήλικες. Cf. Skr. *dur-a-dabhma*, *anaviprayukta* (explained by *na viprayukta*), and the more doubtful *anavadya*, and see Whitney, Gram. § 1121, b. We may add that a confusion of ἀνέεδνος and ἄεδνος (*ἀεδνος) both negative compounds, may have led to a sort of blend in ἀνάεδνος.

Froehde, l. c., would connect ἀνάπνευστος with ἀναπνέω, being shortened by ‘haplogy’ from *ἀν-ανάπνευστος, as ἄποινα from *ἀπο-ποινα; then again ἀνάγνωστος by analogy. But it is in favor of the assumption of a doubling of the negative prefix that ἄγνωστος and ἄπνευστος are words in good standing in the literature.

III. FORM AND CLASSIFICATION OF THE COMPOUNDS.

The great productiveness of these negative formations and the inseparable character of the first part might raise the question whether these words are really to be considered as true compounds and whether the first element is not to be looked upon as a mere prefix, one of the few which the I-E. language possessed. Prefixes have, however, in general a very definite meaning and function. They are not, like the suffixes, so liable to be reduced to

the level of mere formative elements. Hence, there is no great inappropriateness in the common designation of words, other than derivatives, which contain these prefixes as compounds.

It has been found convenient for our purpose to classify as follows the Greek words containing the negative prefix :

I. Immutata (determinatives).

- a. ἀ-priv. + ordinary adj., as ἀβάρβαρος.
- b. ἀ-priv. + vbl. in *-τος*, as ἀβατός, ἀβίαστος.
- c. ἀ-priv. + other pples., as ἀέκων, ἀνάρμενος.
- d. ἀ-priv. + noun, as ἀδώτης, ἀνεικαιότης.

II. So-called synthetica.

- e. ἀ-priv. + verbal root, as ἄτριψ, ἀφανής.

III. Mutata (so-called possessives).

- f. ἀ-priv. + noun, with or without new adjectivising suffix, as ἀθυμος, ἀναίμων, ἀθεμίστιος.

IV. Derivatives.

- g. Negative compound + adjective, noun, or verbal root, as ἀδαμαντοπέδιλος, ἀδικοπραγής.
- h. Nouns, as ἀεργία, mostly abstract.
- i. Adjectives, as ἀεργηλός.
- k. Adverbs (except those regularly formed in *-ως*), as ἀεκητί.
- l. Verbs, as ἀδυνατέω.

For the basis of this classification see L. Schroeder, Ueber die Formelle Unterscheidung der Redetheile, pp. x, 203, 287. All the true negative compounds belong to class II in the classification of Greek compounds given by Brugmann, Gr. Gram.³ §§ 153, 159.

In practice it is often impossible to discriminate between the compounds of groups *e* and *f*, and occasionally of group *a*. Take for example ἀβλαβής; one may doubt whether we have here a mutation from a noun βλάβη or βλάβος, or a syntheticon from the verbal root appearing in βλάπτω. In many cases neither the meaning nor the presence or absence of a suitable noun which may have entered into composition is decisive. In many of the early examples the formation is quite obscure. Often in late Greek, as in other phenomena of the period, the formations seem to be made on the analogy of established types, so that it is no

longer possible to define precisely the separate elements of the compound. The ancients were more inclined than later and modern grammarians to look upon the second members of compounds as verbal; see Zacher, *Breslauer Philologische Abhandlungen*, I, pp. 10 ff., 48–61. So the Homeric lexicon of Apollonius explains ἀδεής by οὐ δεδιώς, while the Et. Mag. gives: ἀδεές ἀφοβον ἀπὸ τοῦ δέος. Cf. too the frequent pairs of doublets like ἀφθονος, ἀφθόνητος, et. al.

Outside of the dithyrambic and comic poets the moderation of the Greek is shown in the general limitation of the compounds to two parts. But while the compounds are generally bi-membral, occasionally one of the members is itself a compound; so as early as Homer we find ἀνιπτό-ποδες, ἀ-προτίμαστος, then ἀν-επί-ξεστος (Hes.), ἀϊδρο-δίκης, ἀδαμαντο-πέδιλος (Pind.), ἀκαμαντο-ρόας (Bacchyl.), etc.

IV. LIMITATIONS ON THE USE OF THE PREFIX IN COMPOSITION.

The true sphere of the negative prefix is its combination with nouns, adjectives and verbal stems to form adjective compounds. The nouns and verbs with *a*-privative are in general not compounds at all, but are derivatives from compound adjectives. The prefix can never properly be combined with a verb to form a negative verb, nor with a pronoun or pronominal word to form an indefinite pronoun. In this respect the pro-ethnic speech seems to have kept quite distinct the prefix and the independent adverbs *ne*, *nē*, etc. The former was used only before nouns, including adjectives, participles and infinitives, the latter with verbs and also with pronouns to form the negative indefinites. The negative adverbs never became productively used as prefixes except in the Balto-Slavic, where for example Lithuanian *nè* (I-E. *ne*) quite usurped the place of the original negative prefix. But it is to be observed that *nè* in Lithuanian, having become a true negative prefix, is not used to form negative indefinite pronouns and adverbs. So in Greek, which has lost I-E. *ne* as a negative adverb, the independent adverbs *οὐ* and *μή* are used to

form indefinites, as *οὐτις*, *μήτις*, *οὐποτε*, *οὐδείς* and the rest. *οὐτις* probably took the place of an I-E.* *ne-qi-s* when *οὐ* had taken the place of I-E. *ne* (Brugmann, op. cit. Eng. trans. II, pt. I, § 31). In a negative sentence containing an indefinite pronoun or adverb it is immaterial, so far as the sense is concerned, whether the negative is taken with the indefinite or the verb. Thus the negative adverb, i. e. the sentence negative, and not the negative prefix, came to be used in this combination, which got to be felt and used as a compound, favored no doubt by the fact that the accentless indefinite was attracted by the strongly accented negative. Cf. Delbrück, Vgl. Synt. II, p. 524.

Rare and decidedly irregular are the instances in Sanskrit of the use of the negative prefix with demonstratives, as in *a-sas* and *an-esas*.

The infinitives and participles being nominal in their origin must at first have taken the negative prefix and not the negative adverb; cf. in Greek forms like *ἀέκων*, *ἀεκαζόμενος*, *ἀελπτέοντες*, *ἀφρονέοντες*, *ἀνάρμενος*, *ἀτίξων*, *ἀνομολογούμενος*, *ἀδάμας*. Knauer, K. Z. xxvii, p. 19, cites numerous examples of the composition of the Sanskrit participles belonging to the tense systems with *a(n)*. In the Rigveda *na* is not found with participles and perhaps not in Sanskrit prose (Delbrück, Vgl. Synt. II, p. 529). There are a goodly number of examples of combinations of the present participle in Gothic with *un-* and in Latin with *in-*. But in general the composition with the negative prefix declines when the participle, as in Greek, becomes more closely attached to the verb and assumes more of verbal and less of adjectival character. The participles ordinarily included in the verbal paradigm are rarely, indeed only exceptionally, thus combined; the forms mentioned above, *ἀέκων*, etc., have all more or less of the adjectival character which seems to have belonged of old to the participle and is especially seen where the participle enters into composition; cf. proper names like *Εὐρυμέδων*, *Εὐέλθων*, *Πολυσπέρχων*. By their side are found *οὐκ ἐθέλων* et al.; *ἀνυπεσταλμένως* is late. It is not surprising then to observe that even as early as Homer the use of the negative adverb *οὐ* with the participle is already well established (Monro, H. G., § 360), although it is certainly not so freely combined with the participle

in Homer as in later Greek. The second parts of the compounds ἀδάμας, ἀκάμας, though no longer independently existing, have lost their participial character and are practically adjectives; so ἀτστωρ, ἀκράτωρ. Only with the participle in -τος is the combination with the negative prefix at all productive, but the verbals in -τος are not generally formed on a special tense-stem, are not reckoned as a part of the verbal paradigm and are often merely adjectives expressing fitness or capacity. They seem even in Indo-European times to have been combined freely with the negative prefix, as they are in all the separate languages.

Sanskrit, Latin, German and particularly English offer many more examples than Latin or Greek of the combination of the negative prefix with the present participle, but in Latin the examples are far less rare than in Greek and it is in Greek that the participle has come most to be used as a substitute for a subordinate finite verb. Cf. Sk. *avidvān*, Lat. *insciens*, Germ. *unwissend*, Eng. *unknowing*, but Gr. οὐκ εἰδώς.

The infinitive in Greek has become too distinctly verbal in its nature to take the negative prefix; even in Sanskrit it seems to take it very rarely except when used with the verb *çak*, Speijer, Sanskrit Synt. § 404. On the other hand at an earlier period, when the infinitive was more distinctly nominal in its nature, the aversion of the language to combining the negative prefix directly with a noun would render ἀ-δύνασθαι quite as awkward as ἀ-δύναμις.

The negation of the finite verb in Greek by an ἀ-privative is to be looked upon as an anomaly. Professor Bloomfield, J. H. U. Circ., 1882, p. 175, in objecting to the etymology of ἀμβλακεῦ given by Curtius (Grundzüge, 5, p. 463) and adopted by Vaniček, says, “The composition of ἀ-primitive with a simple aorist stem would be an anomaly as great as a compound *ἀ-πέπονθα, ‘I have not suffered.’” When we have ἀτίει in Theogn. 621,

πᾶς τις πλούσιον ἄνδρα τίει, ἀτίει δὲ πενιχρόν,

the compound is evidently an artistic product formed for the sake of antithesis to *τίει* preceding. Brugmann, Griech. Gram.³ § 590, treats ἀτίει as an extension of paradigm from ἀτιτος (Hom.). Parallel with this is a passage in Plut. Mor. 885 A, ὥστε τὰ μὲν

εἰμάρθαι τὰ δὲ ἀνειμάρθαι, where Usener with MS. D reads *τὰ μὲν εἴμαρτὰ τὰ δὲ ἀνειμαρτὰ*. So the Sanskrit *āpacasi* is a purely artificial form. The Homeric *ἀτίξων*, Il. 20, 166, occurring as it does in the participle, if it is really a negative compound, does not count here on account of the original nominal character of the participle, and *ἀτίξων* is probably to be classed with *ἀεκαζόμενος*, *ἀέκων* and *ἀνομολογούμενος* (not a participle from a verb *ἀνομολογοῦμαι*). Later such a form might be expanded into a verbal paradigm, and that the Homeric *ἀτίξων* was so expanded by the poets, as the tragedians and Apollonius Rhodius, does not excite surprise. It is not found in prose until Galen, who uses *ἀτίξόμενος*, and Greg. Naz., who uses the finite verb. Cf. Lat. *indecet* and *injuro*, probably extensions from *indecens* and *injuratus*, and *ignosco* considered by V. Henry a re-formation from *ignotus*. So the inseparable *δυσ-* in *δυσθυήσκων*, Eur. El. 843, Rhes. 791, *δυσθανόντα*, schol. to Luc. Icarom. 29, is somewhat legitimized by being combined only with the participle. It may be, however, that *ἀτίξω* is a denominative verb, see Froehde, Bezz. Beitr. xx, p. 221. On *ἀτιμάω*, see Brugmann, Griech. Gram.³, p. 529.

Before vowels there is the possibility that the verb is a compound of the preposition *ἀνά*, which sometimes denotes a reversal of the action of the verb and gives a negative sense. Thus *ἀναράομαι* means ‘to recall a curse’ and *ἀνεύχομαι* ‘to unsay a prayer.’ Cf. Lat. *resecrare*, Germ. *widersprechen*. On the derivation of *ἀναίνομαι* from *ἀνά* + * *ainomai* (cf. *ainos*, a saying) see Osthoff, Bezz. Beitr. 24, 199 ff., esp. p. 205. *ἀνεύχομαι*, so far as we know, occurs only in the participle, Plat. Alcib. II, 142 D, 148 B, and the articular infinitive, Poll. v, 130. The poet in Plat. Alcib. II, 143 A, uses *ἀνεύκτοις* as the negative of *εὐχομένοις*, while the author of the dialogue himself says, 142 D, *εὖξαντο ἀν* *δλίγον δὲ ἐπισχόντες ἐνίστε παλινῳδοῦσιν, ἀνευχόμενοι* *ἄττ'* *ἀν τὸ πρῶτον εὔξωνται*.

ἀνήδομαι in Hermippus, frag. 81 M, 77 K, was thought by Shillito, Jour. of Philol. VII, 159, to be a compound of *ἀνά*, but it seems not unlikely that it is an artificial compound made with the privative prefix for the sake of antithesis to the preceding *ἥσθην*, and so parallel to the examples already cited from Theognis and

Plutarch. The fragment is: ἀ τόθ' ἥσθην, ταῦτα νῦν ἀνήδομαι. Comedy is just the place for such a formation, but it is not impossible here that we may have a blending of both the preposition *ἀνά* and the negative in these formations.

ἀνομοιώω is probably a derivative from *ἀνόμοιος*, and *ἀνανδρόμοιαι* from *ἄνανδρος*.

It may be found that some English verbs like ‘undo,’ ‘unfasten,’ and the like, may have been first formed for the sake of opposition to the single verbs, as in the Greek examples cited above. An adherescent negative adverb might have been felt not to make a close enough compound and again not to give sufficient opposition, but only the negation of the positive idea. It is interesting to note, however, that the use of *un-* with verbs in English seems to have come in through confusion with the Anglo-Saxon inseparable prefix *ond, and, on*, which is often = *re-*, denoting the reversal of an action and quite indistinguishable from the negative in meaning. Cf. Maetzner, *Englische Grammatik*, I, p. 540.

In the case of verbal adjectives with initial *ἀν-* followed by a vowel, as *ἀνάλωτος*, *ἀνεξεύρετος*, some ambiguity might arise as to whether the verbal was derived from a simple verb and then compounded with the negative prefix, or whether it was formed on a verb already combined with the preposition *ἀνά*. Funck in Curt. Stud., x, 41, has treated this subject and shown that in Greek the external ambiguity of the words was hardly felt, for the language never employed the same word at the same period in both the different senses.

For the ambiguity in Latin between the prefix *in-* and the preposition *in-*, as in *invisus inauratus*, see F. Vogel, Archiv. f. Lat. Lex. u. Gram., iv, p. 321. Cf. *inclinatus*, bent, Juv. 15, 63, but *indeclinatus*, unswerving, Ov. Epp. ex Ponto, 4, 10, 83. Yet when Wölfflin, ibid., p. 400, says that *in-privatum* does not appear before verbs on account of liability to confusion with the preposition *in*, he hardly gives the fundamental reason, for the absence of composition of verb with the privative syllable was most certainly Indo-European.

The negative adverb may sometimes form a *quasi* compound with the verb making the combination so close that the negative is rarely displaced from its position immediately before the verb

and that the negative *οὐ* is retained even in cases where *μή* would be required by ordinary usage. In these cases the particle usually does something more than merely negative the meaning of the simple verb, and the combination expresses an opposite rather than a negative solely. Examples are: *οὐ φημι*, 'I deny,' *οὐκ ἔω*, 'I forbid,' *οὐκ ἐθέλω*, 'I am unwilling,' *οὐκ ἐπαινῶ*, 'I disapprove.' Cf. Lat. *nescio*—from which probably *nescius*—*nequo*, *neclego*. In *οὐκ ἀλέγω* we probably see more nearly a merely negative combination.

In most of these cases the verb is one of saying or thinking and often one which would naturally be followed by the infinitive, so that the adherescence of the negative to the verb seems in part at least due to the reluctance of the early language to combine the negative adverb with the infinitive.

The necessity for forming such *quasi* compounds of the verb, which might at first thought seem to be far-reaching, was largely relieved by the capacity of the language for forming denominative verbs from negative adjective compounds, as *ἀψευδεῖν* from *ἀψευδῆς*, and to some extent also by the fact that several of the prepositions practically reversed the meaning of the verb with which they were combined. Cf. for such a use of *ἀνά*, *ἀναράμαται*, etc., already cited. This reversing force of *ἀνά* is very natural with a verb which denotes downward motion, e. g., *ἐρείπω*, throw down, *ἀνηρειψάμην*, snatched up; *μύω*, close (lower) the eyelids, *ἀναμύω*, open the eyes; see Lobeck, *Rhematikon*, p. 43. For *ἀπό* cf. *ἀπεσθίειν* = *μὴ ἐσθίειν*, *Theopomp. Com. Mein.*, II, p. 813, fr. 62 κ. Somewhat similar are *ἀποσιτεῖν*, *ἀποκηδεῖν*, *ἀποπαρθενεύεσθαι* which Meineke cites; also *ἀποκαλύπτω*, uncover, *ἀπανδάω*, forbid, and cf. especially *ἀφανδάνω*, *Soph. Ant.* 501. With *διά* we have *διαζεύγνυματι*, to be disjoined, cf. Halsey, *Proc. Am. Philol. Assn.*, 1888, p. xxiv.

The statement already made, that the sphere of direct combination of the privative syllable in Greek is its union with noun, adjective and verbal stem to form adjectives, contains the important limitation that the prefix is only irregularly and exceptionally combined with nouns to form nouns. This limitation holds also in general for Latin of the best period, but not for Sanskrit, English or German. The privative syllable will, as a rule, be found before

nouns in Greek only in mutata; in immutata it can, generally speaking, be combined only with the adjective. We find in Liddell and Scott only 16 probable immutata with nouns.

Such immutata of ἀ-privative + noun as do occur are plainly exceptional and irregular artificial formations, mostly poetic or late. Hesiod has ἀδώτης, Op. 355, and ἀβούτης, *ibid.*, 451; vv. 354–5 are :

καὶ δόμεν' ὅς κεν δῶ, καὶ μὴ δόμεν' ὅς κεν μὴ δῷ.
δώτη μέν τις ἔδωκεν, ἀδώτη δὲ οὐτις ἔδωκε.

Here δώτης and ἀδώτης are both evidently formed for the antithesis and so are hardly amenable to the ordinary laws of formation. In Op. 451, *κραδίην δὲ ἔδακ' ἀνδρὸς ἀβούτεω*, ἀβούτης is plainly the negative of βούτης, ‘herdsman;’ the latter, however, does not occur in Hesiod, but is found in Aeschylus and later. To one who had already just said ἀδώτης in antithesis to δώτης, it would not seem so bold to say ἀβούτης even if no form βούτης was actually present, though βούτης was probably then in use. But ἀβούτης here may have been felt as an adjective; cf. Eur. Hipp. 537 (lyric), βούταν φόνον. Lobeck, Path. Gr. Serm., I, p. 213, makes it = *ἀβους lengthened by addition of suffix -τη-.

In Arist. Phys., I, 8, 3, and perhaps in Hippocrates is found ἀνίατρος = a non-physician, quack, in opposition to *iatros*,¹ and in Plut. Lyc., X, ἀπλούτος, poverty, in opposition to πλούτος.

Pollux, III, 58, censure three words used by Theopompus : παμπόνηροι δὲ οἱ Θεοπόμπου τοῦ συγγραφέως ἀπολίται, καὶ ἀφέταιροι, καὶ ἀπαθηναῖοι. But as the latter two words are formed with the preposition ἀπό, this may have been the feeling also in the case of ἀπολίται, without the necessity of assuming a haplology for *ἀπο-πολιται.

Priscian, Keil, III, 211, uses two grammatical terms, σύμβαμα and ἀσύμβαμα, which he ascribes to the Stoics and which he renders by *congruitas* and *incongruitas*.

Other examples are : ἀδικαιάρχος Cic., formed for the sake of a

¹ But δὲ ιατρός, Plat. Gorg. 459 B; cf. Sudhaus, Philodemus, II, 6, τῶν μὴ βητέρων.

pun, ἀναξία Zeno ap. Diog. L., ἀπειθαρχία Antiphon ap. An. Bek. 78, ἀπληροφορία Byz., ἀπροσδοκία Def. Plat., ἄρροια and ἀχρεία Hippocr., and probably the Attic ἀστρατεία.

In Hippocrates, 379, 17 (Foes.), III, 496 (Erm.), the authority of the MSS. is for $\tau\hat{\eta}$ ἀναριστήσει (ἀν-αρίστησις), but Ermerins now reads $\tau\hat{\eta}$ ἀναριστήγ.

There is another group of compounds, sometimes referred to this class, which are artificial formations and are distinctly poetic and figurative in their use. This group comprises the compounds which appear in the not infrequent poetic expressions of the type, *Ipos "Aīpos*, Od. 18, 73, *παιδες ἀπαιδες*, Aesch. Eum. 1034 et al. These formations seem undoubtedly to belong to the mutata and will be best discussed under the head of style.

Wöefflin, Archiv, IV, 400 ff., has taken up the subject of 'Substantiva mit in-privatum' in Latin. He finds that such formations are almost entirely absent from Latin of the Golden and Silver Ages. From archaic Latin are cited only *intemperies*, *insatietas*, *ingratiis*, *iniussu* and *irreligio*. The later more productive employment of such compounds, e. g., *involuntas* et al., is confined almost exclusively to ecclesiastical and late Latin, is characteristic of the Africitas beginning with Tertullian, and arises in part from the license of vulgar speech and in part from the exigencies of translation from the Greek.

In English a few words of the type, unbelief, undress, unrest, are in use, but they are not to be coined at will, while in German the type is quite productive, nouns like *Unmuth*, *Ungeduld*, being rather numerous.

Even in Sanskrit, where compounds like *adeva*, non-god, *akirti*, non-fame, disgrace, are very common, the mutata of a-privative + noun seem relatively more frequent. In the immutata of this type most often the second member seems to be an abstract noun. Cf. Delbrück, Vgl. Synt., II, p. 530.

Outside of the strictly bi-membral divisions which characterize philosophical thought and which give rise to expressions like the Aristotelian $\tau\hat{o}\ o\vee k\ \alpha\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\sigma$, Interp., X, 1, the need of a definite compound to express the conception of negation of a concrete noun is not very great and the requirements of expression are more easily satisfied by the less permanent combinations of rela-

tive and participial periphrases. Often there is an opposing positive term, as *ξένος*, opposed to *πολίτης*, or as *ἰδιώτης* is opposed to any professional designation, such as *ἰατρός*, *ἄρχων*, etc.

With abstract terms, however, the case is different and one naturally stops to inquire how the Greek expressed the negative of terms like *δίκη*, *φόβος*, etc. A little examination will show that these negative abstracts are most often derivatives from negative mutata, so that we have *δίκη*, *ἀδίκος*, *ἀδίκια*; *φόβος*, *ἄφοβος*, *ἄφοβία*, giving us the pairs, *δίκη*, *ἀδίκια*, *φόβος*, *άφοβία*. When once the type is established, the intermediate mutatum may be dispensed with and we may have *ἀδύναμία* (Hdt.) opposed to *δύναμις*, though *ἀδύναμος* is not found till Dioscorides.

With ordinary adjectives (excluding verbals in *-τος*) the combination of the negative prefix is by no means free and generally productive, but on the contrary the number of direct combinations of a-privative + adjective seem on examination to be surprisingly small, especially in the earliest period.

Many undoubtedly old adjectives do not make any negative compounds at all, but have their opposites expressed by positive words, e. g., *μέγας*, *μικρός*; *ἀγαθός*, *κακός*; *μέλας*, *λευκός*; *βαρύς*, *κοῦφος*; *μακρός*, *βραχύς*; *εὐρύς*, *στενός*; *καθαρός*, *μιαρός*. So generally with adjectives expressing merely physical qualities; thus none of the adjectives in the list just given makes a negative compound except *κακός*, which has not generally a physical sense. In the case of many such words no necessity for a negative compound was ever felt. We have no **ἀμάλακος* or **ἀχάλεπος* (*ἀχαλέπως* in Math. Vett.), no **ἀμικρος* or **ἀμεγας* (*ἀμεγεθής* Aristotle). **ἄψυχρος* and **ἄνυγρος* are not found, and *ἄθερμος* is perhaps a *ἄπαξ εἰρημένον*, used as an abstract, *τὸ άθερμον*, Plat. Phaedo, 106 A. Lobeck, Path. Gr. Serm., p. 213, states that negatives are not found from adjectives of the second declension denoting color or taste; *ἄπικρος*, however, does occur in Aristotle.

But this reluctance of the language to combine a-privative with an adjective is by no means limited to words of any particular semasiological category, and, though the number of such compounds is substantially increased in the later language, this type was never a favorite form of composition. Examples like *ἄϊδρις*,

ἀναιτίος by the side of *ἴδρις*, *αῖτιος* are few in Homer, not more than 10, and some of these are uncertain.

When we deduct from the total number of words containing the negative prefix the compounds formed from the verbals in *-τος*, the mutata, the derivative nouns and verbs, and a few other types of formation, the proportion of the whole consisting of combinations of a-privative + adjective, especially in the best period, is small.

Thus many derivative adjectives find their opposites in a negative possessive compound, or mutatum. Just as the opposite of *δίκη* is not **ἀ-δίκη*, but *ἀδικία*, so the opposite of *δίκαιος* is not **ἀ-δίκαιος*, but *ἄδικος*. Hence there is a large number of such groups of derivative words related to an abstract primitive, e. g.,

δίκη : δίκαιος = ἀδικία : ἄδικος,
φόβος : φοβερός = ἀφοβία : ἄφοβος,
κόσμος : κόσμιος = ἀκόσμια : ἄκοσμος. Cf. pp. 25, 31.

Valckenaer on Eur. Phoen. 397, denied the formation of derivative verbs from compounds of a-privative + a dissyllabic adjective of the second declension except verbals in *-τος*. But, as we have seen, the number of such compound adjectives is at any rate very limited, and Shilleto, Tr. Camb. Philol. Soc. 1876, p. 74, added *ἀδηλεῖν* to the *συνασοφεῖν* of Eur., l. c.

The cacophony in the repetition of the syllable *av* may account for the absence of some compounds of *av*-privative and a word beginning with *av-*. Thus from Greek of the best period, outside of Hippocrates, we have only *ἀνανδρος*, *ἀνανδρία* Aesch., *ἀνάνδρωτος* Soph., *ἀνανθής* Plato, *ἀνανταγώνιστος* Thuc. **ἀνανάγκαιος* is not found, nor any compound of the negative prefix with *ἀνθρωπος* or its derivatives; and note *οὐκ ἀνεκτός*, which is very frequent. Later Greek was not so fastidious, so in Cicero's epistles we find: *ἀναντίλεκτος*, *ἀναντιφώνητος*, *ἀναντιφωνησία*; the latter two are not found elsewhere.

V. FAVORITE TYPES OF NEGATIVE COMPOUNDS.

The favorite Greek types of compound with the negative prefix are those with the verbals in *-τος* and the mutata made up of prefix + noun. Both of these types were Indo-European and were apparently the most common types in the pro-ethnic speech also.

The compound with the verbal in *-τος* is the most productive of all the types in Greek as in the other languages of the family. This is doubtless partly due to the fact that it is susceptible of so many variations in meaning. Thus the words which compose this group are not simply past participles but they are also very often modal verbal adjectives negativing the idea of fitness or possibility, and hence are no longer past in signification. This modal use is Indo-European and it is in combination with the negative that the verbal seems first to have acquired a modal sense; whence the usage became extended, particularly in Greek, to the simple forms. Again these verbal compounds may be active, passive, or neuter. Indeed the fundamental signification of the verbal itself seems to have been only the predication of a verbal action as in some way a quality or characteristic of the subject. Cf. Bishop, A. J. P., XIII, 191; Brugmann, I. G. Forsch., v, 93. It is not surprising that such a convenient type of formation should have become so largely productive. A Greek negative compound with the verbal may often be rendered variously into Latin, especially by a compound of *in-* with a participle in *-ns*, *-tus*, or *-ndus*, or by an adjective in *-bilis*, e. g., *ἀπράκτος* by *inficiens* or *infectus*, *ἀπιστός* by *incredibilis*, *incredulus*, and (late) *incredundus*, *increditus*. Noteworthy is the large number of Latin negative compounds ending in *-bilis*.

Often the negative compound with the verbal is equivalent in meaning to a mutatum of a-privative + noun. Thus, *ἀπύρωτος* (*πυρόω*) Il. 23, 270 = *ἀπυρός*, ibid., 267; *ἀφθόνητος* (*φθονέω*) = *ἀφθονός*, both in active (Pind. Ol. 13, 25) and passive sense (ibid.,

10, 7); ἀναύδητος (*αὐδάω*) = ἀναυδός; ἀτάρακτος (*ταράσσω*) = ἀτάραχος. Sometimes, however, no intermediate verb from which the verbal may be derived seems to exist, so that the verbal is in effect, though not in form, a sort of denominative participle, e. g., ἀπέδιλος, Aesch. Prom. 135 = ἀπεδίλωτος, Callim., vi, 125, but there is no verb *πεδίλόω; so ἀπυνδάκωτος (*πύνδαξ*), Soph. frag. 554 = ἀπύθμενος, Hesych. = ἀπύθμων, Theognost. = ἀπυθμένιστος, Eustath. See Schneider on Callim., Hymn III, 213. The above are not to be confused with adjectives which are formally denominative, and in which the suffix *-το-* is appended immediately to a nominal stem, as in ἀγέραστος from γέρας. They are to be distinguished too from verbals derived from denominative verbs, which latter are in turn derivatives from true negative compounds. Thus ἀλόγητος from ἀλογέω, but ἀλογέω from ἀλογος.

The other very frequent type of negative compound in Greek is that of the mutata of a-privative + noun, the so-called possessives. In its origin this type seems not to have been a true compound at all, but a derivative adjective made by giving to an immutatum that variation according to gender which characterizes an adjective. But the formation is a very old one and independently productive, so that for very few of the existing mutata can underlying immutata be cited. The fact that compounds whose second member is a substantive in *-ος* or *-ον* do not regularly make a special form for the feminine is significant. The type is perhaps older than the use of the *ā*-forms to denote the feminine gender, and later forms like ἀτεχνος, *-ον*, from τέχνη may be explained as made on the analogy of the pre-established type; see Brugmann, K. Z. 24, 39 ff., Wheeler, Trans. Am. Philol. Assn. 30, xxi ff.

This type of negative compound is well represented in Greek and Sanskrit, is not very common in Latin (cf. *iners*, *inops*, et al.) and is foreign to German and English. On the other hand in the last two languages, as already remarked, the immutata are not at all uncommon.

VI. EXPRESSIONS WHICH MAY REPLACE THE NEGATIVE COMPOUNDS.

The negative compound may be replaced by a complex with a negative adverb or by other forms of expression which, though not negative in form, are so or nearly so in effect.

The negative of the sentence and of the verb may in various ways become extended in its use to other parts of speech—the so-called *oὐ*-privative, Thompson, Gr. Synt., §§ 280–1. First, the close and constant combination of the negative adverb with the verb may persist with other words, particularly participles, which are derivatives from the verbal root or stem. Thus we have an old Greek compound, *Oὐκαλέγων*, to be connected with the fact that the verb *ἀλέγω* is used in Homer most often with a negative. Other illustrations are *οὐκ ἐθέλων*, *οὐ χαιρῶν*, *οὐκ ἐών*, to be referred to the close association of negative and verb in *οὐκ ἐθέλω*, *οὐ χαιρήσει*, *οὐκ ἐώ*, and also of course to the intimate connection of the participle with the verbal paradigm. One may compare Latin *nescius* for *inscius* by the side of *nescio*.

Secondly, by confusion or displacement of the negative relations in the sentence from which a nexus of the negative and noun, adjective, or adverb might result. Peculiar conditions of emphasis and metre often bring the negative into a position in the sentence which seems very arbitrary; so the position of the negative in the poets, especially Pindar, is apparently very free. In sentences where the predicate is in the form of a noun or adjective with the sentence negative, especially where either the necessity for a copula is not felt or the substantive verb is only a copula, a sort of adherescence may take place; cf. cases like *οὐκ ἀγαθόν περ ἔοντα*, Il. 9, 637, *οὐδὲ ἄλιον ἔπος ἔσσεται*, Il. 24, 92 (so often with *οὐχ ἄλιος*, a common litotes in Homer); also *οὐκ ἔρανος τάδε γέστιν*, Od. 1, 226. The Latin well exemplifies the working of such a process in *nefas* and *nimirum*. *Nefas* probably started in the sentence, *ne fas (est)*, at a period when *ne* had not yet given place to *non* as the sentence negative in Latin; cf. the common use of *fas est* and the frequency of *nefas* and *nimirum* as

parenthetical exclamations. *Nefastus*, *nefandus*, *nefarius* are of course derivatives. Again such confusion or displacement of the negative might occur in other relations within the sentence, as in the case of an object, or an adjective, or an adverbial modifier. Note expressions like *οὐκ ἀποφάλια εἰδώς*, Od. 5, 182, *ὅδ' οὐχ ἄλιον βέλος ἤκεν*, Il. 15, 575, *σὺ δὲ οὐ κατὰ μοῖραν ἔειπες*, Od. 2, 251, *οὐ κόσμῳ παρὰ ναῦφιν ἐλευσόμεθ' αὐτὰ κέλευθα*, Il. 12, 225; so *οὐ κατὰ κόσμον*, Il. 2, 214, and frequently. Note the Sanskrit adverbs *naciram* and *māciram*, and cf. Whitney, Gram. 1122 E.

Such an extension of the use of the negative originally belonging to the sentence or to the verb to combinations with parts of speech other than the verb is probably inevitable in any language and, as we have seen (p. 17) is regular in the case of the indefinite pronouns. But some of these uses of the negative adverb with parts of speech other than the verb may date back to the period when the negative adverb and the negative prefix were as yet undifferentiated. Various conditions, however, must have operated to make this use of the negative adverbs a part of the language's ordinary means of expression. Such a combination was less permanent and more readily produced than a compound with the negative prefix and would often be used where no corresponding compound with the prefix was in familiar use or, if it was, could not be used in certain metres, e. g., *ἀνωνόμαστος*, which appears first in Euripides and which was barred from the hexameter, is represented in Homer and Hesiod by *οὐκ ὀνομαστός*. So doubtless *metri causa* *οὐ θεμιστοῦ*, Aesch. Sept. 694, is used = *ἀθεμίστου*. Then for various reasons most adjectives never formed compounds with the negative prefix; e. g., **ἀν-άπαρνος*, **ἀν-ανάγκαιος*, **ἀ-κάθαρος* seem not to have existed. Hence we must have in Antiphon, 1, 9, *οὐκ οὖσαν ἄπαρνον*; 5, 11, *τοῦς μὴ καθαροῖς*; Xen. Rep. Lac. 5, 4, *τὰς οὐκ ἀναγκαίας πόσεις*. In general the compounds combining directly the negative prefix and the adjective, being not at all numerous in Greek, must be to some extent replaced by the combination of negative adverb and adjective, especially where no positive of precisely opposite signification was in use. Sometimes the combination (*παράθεσις*) of negative adverb and adjective is so close as to be almost equal to composition (*σύνθεσις*). In such cases *οὐ* may be retained

where the generic $\mu\hat{\eta}$ would be expected, and thus we may explain some, though of course not all, of the cases like $\tauο\bar{n}\dot{s}\; o\bar{u}\chi\; o\bar{i}o\bar{u}s\;\tau\epsilon\;\delta\bar{n}t\alpha\bar{s}$, Lys. 20, 19 = $\tauο\bar{n}\dot{s}\;\dot{\alpha}\bar{d}o\bar{n}\dot{a}t\alpha\bar{s}\;\delta\bar{n}t\alpha\bar{s}$; $\tauο\bar{n}\dot{s}\; o\bar{u}\chi\;\dot{o}\bar{m}o\bar{f}u\bar{l}o\bar{s}$, Just. Mar. Apol. 1, 14; $\tau\bar{o}n\; o\bar{u}k\;\dot{o}\bar{r}\theta\bar{w}o\bar{s}\;\chi\bar{r}\bar{o}\bar{w}me\bar{v}o\bar{n}o\bar{s}$, Plat. Gorg. 457 c.

The participle, showing its close connection with the verbal system, regularly takes the negative of the verb even when the participle has almost a purely adjectival sense, e. g., $o\bar{u}\;\pi\bar{r}o\bar{s}\bar{y}\bar{k}o\bar{w}o\bar{s}$, as in Antiphon, tetral. Γ, α, 3; Or. v, 2. The readiness with which occasional complexes of negative adverb and participle could be formed may account in part at least for the reluctance of the language to form compounds of negative prefix + adjective, cf. p. 25. Cf. Prof. Gildersleeve, A. J. P., IX, 139, n. 3, end. The rarity of the compounding of the negative prefix with participles belonging to the tense systems is noticed elsewhere (p. 18), and the use of the sentence negative with the participle is a matter of course where the participle is consciously used as a substitute for the verb of a subordinate sentence. Yet an approximation to a strictly verbal use of the participle compounded with the negative prefix is seen in Latin *me indicente*, *me insciente* (abl. abs.), and a few others, see Delbrück, Vgl. Synt., II, 529.

The reluctance of the Greek language to form immutata of a -privative + noun left it often with pressing needs of expression which the use of the negative articular infinitive, the formation of new abstract derivatives, or the employment of periphrases with the relative or participle could not relieve. So we have: $\delta\bar{i}\;\dot{\alpha}\bar{p}e\bar{r}o\bar{s}\bar{u}n\bar{h}o\bar{s}\;ko\bar{u}k\;\dot{\alpha}\bar{p}o\bar{d}e\bar{i}\bar{x}i\bar{n}o\bar{s}$, Eur. Hipp. 195 f.; $\dot{e}\bar{v}\;o\bar{u}\;ka\bar{i}\bar{r}\bar{o}\bar{w}$, id. Bacch. 1287; $\dot{\eta}\;\mu\bar{\eta}\;'\mu\bar{p}e\bar{i}\bar{r}\bar{a}$, Ar. Eccl. 115; $\tau\bar{h}o\bar{n}\;\mu\bar{\eta}\;\dot{\epsilon}\bar{p}i\bar{t}r\bar{o}\bar{p}\bar{h}o\bar{s}$, Plat. Legg., XII, 966 c. A number of examples are found in Thucydides: $\tau\bar{h}o\bar{n}\;\tau\bar{h}o\bar{n}\;\gamma\bar{e}\bar{f}u\bar{r}\bar{o}\bar{w}o\bar{n}\dots o\bar{u}\;\deltai\bar{a}\bar{l}u\bar{s}i\bar{n}o\bar{s}$, I, 37, 4; $\tau\bar{h}o\bar{n}\;o\bar{u}\;\pi\bar{e}\bar{r}i\bar{t}e\bar{i}\bar{c}hi\bar{s}i\bar{n}o\bar{s}$, III, 95, 2; $\tau\bar{h}o\bar{n}\;\tau\bar{h}o\bar{n}\;\chi\bar{a}\bar{r}\bar{i}\bar{w}o\bar{n}\;\dot{\alpha}\bar{l}\bar{l}\bar{h}\bar{l}\bar{o}\bar{i}\bar{s}\;o\bar{u}k\;\dot{\alpha}\bar{p}\bar{o}\bar{d}o\bar{s}i\bar{n}o\bar{s}$, V, 35, 2; $\tau\bar{h}o\bar{n}\;o\bar{u}k\;\dot{\epsilon}\bar{x}o\bar{n}o\bar{s}i\bar{a}n\;\tau\bar{h}i\bar{s}\;\dot{\alpha}\bar{g}o\bar{n}\bar{i}\bar{s}e\bar{w}o\bar{s}$, V, 50, 4. Cf. Lat. *negotium* = *nec otium*; **in-otium* was hardly possible. Cf. p. 24. So even with concrete nouns; $\tau\bar{h}o\bar{n}\;o\bar{u}x\bar{i}\;\deltao\bar{u}\bar{l}a\bar{w}o\bar{s}$, Eur. frag. 831; $\tau\bar{h}o\bar{n}\;\mu\bar{\eta}\;\dot{r}\bar{h}\bar{o}\bar{r}\bar{a}\bar{w}o\bar{s}$, Philodemus, Rhet., II, 6, 18; Plat. Gorg. 459 B, has $\dot{o}\;\mu\bar{\eta}\;\dot{i}\bar{a}\bar{t}r\bar{o}\bar{s}$. Cf. *non-orator*, Quint., II, 15, 17. Some of these expressions are due to the need of terms to express the negation of abstract philosophical concepts, e. g., $\tau\bar{o}\;o\bar{u}k$

ἄνθρωπος, Arist. Interp. 10, 1; cf. *non-corpus*, Cic. Ac., I, 11, 40 = *incorporeum* or *incorporale*, and the Hegelian *nicht-ich* (*non-ego*, *non-moi*), *nicht-sein* (*τὸ μὴ ὄν, non-être*). Old French seems to have been fairly productive in these compounds with *non*, but *in-* was early substituted for this, doubtless originally a literary reversion to the Latin. Cf. Darmsteter, *De la création des mots nouveaux dans la langue française*, p. 140. So in English, *non-regardance*, *Shak. Twelfth Night*, Act. V.

For expressions like *οὐ κακοῦργός είμι*, Antiphon, v, 9, the Sanskrit might use a negative compound, cf. *abrāhmaṇa* = anybody but a brahman.

Often too the combination with the negative adverb had to be employed to denote the negation of a quality where the compound with the prefix had come to signify its opposite. Note the difference between *ἄκακος* (Sappho and Aeschylus) and *οὐ κακός*, Ar. Pax. 430. Expressions like the latter lend themselves readily to litotes. In that form of litotes in which an adjective which is already a compound of the negative prefix is again negated, the usage of the language would tolerate nothing else but the negative adverb; so *οὐκ ἄφρων ὁ ξεῖνος οἴεται*, Od. 17, 586, where **ἀνάφρων*, besides being unmetrical, is formally impossible in Greek. There is no litotes, however, in *οὐκ ἀληθῆ*, Antiphon, v, 26; vi, 28, for *ἀληθής* has really lost the force of a negative compound and has come to be felt as a positive, so that in vi, 28, cited above, *οὐκ ἀληθῆ* does duty as a quasi negative compound opposed to a preceding *ἀληθῆ*. Sanskrit has less repugnance to a doubling of the negative prefix; cf. Whitney, Gram. 1121, b. Perhaps we are to see a double negative in *ἀνάεδνος*, where, however, one prefix does not nullify the other (cf. p. 15).

Further examples of the frequent use of the negative adverbs instead of the prefix are due to the tendency of the sentence negative to attach itself to certain adverbs of time and certain conjunctions with which the negative prefix, belonging as it does strictly to noun formations (including nouns, adjectives, and adverbs derived from these), is never used. Such combinations are: *οὐκέτι, οὐπω, οὐποτε, οὐδέ, οὔτε*, etc. So too in the corresponding combinations with the negative *μή*, though the question is here complicated by the special functions of *μή* as a sentence

negative. In Thuc., vii, 34, 6, such an adverb is used even with a noun, *διὰ τὴν τῶν Κορινθίων οὐκέτι ἐπαναγωγήν*, cf. p. 31.

Regular is the use of the sentence negative with adjectives like *πᾶς*, *πάντες*, *πολύς*, *πολλοί*, which are allied to the pronouns or numerals in their meaning and are never in the best period compounded with the negative prefix; *ἄπολυς* occurs in Damascius; *ἄποιος*, Democr. ap. Stob., and *ἄποστος*, Eccl., are technical metaphysical terms. The negative adverb is used also with adverbs like *μάλα*, *σάφα*, *δήν*, and in general with those which were not felt distinctly as derived from nouns or adjectives.

We are told by Choeroboseus that the negative adverb cannot have a distinctly privative force; cf. Et. Mag. 639, 50, *ἡ μὲν στέρησις ἐπιβάλλοντός ἐστιν ἀτενξία, ως ἄτεχνος ρήτωρ, η δὲ ἀπόφασις ως ἔτυχε λαμβάνεται . . . οὐ τεχνικὸς ὁ ὄνος· ἄτεχνος δὲ ὁ ὄνος, οὐ δυνατὸν λέγειν.* But the difference is rather to be explained as due to the characterizing force of compounds in general. *ἄτεχνος* applied to the orator affects his character, not so when it is applied to the ass.

When the negative prefix appears in a mutatum as *ἄτεχνος*, the negative adverb can be used in its place only by combining it with a derivative adjective, as in *οὐ τεχνικός*. A mutatum formed with the negative adverb would be a decided anomaly. Other equivalents for the mutata may be found in phrases with *ἄνευ*, *χωρὶς*, or their equivalents; e. g., *πόνου τοι χωρὶς οὐδὲν εὔτυχεῖ*, Soph. El. 945; *ἄνευ ἀκολούθου*, Plat. Symp. 217 A, *ἄτερ κόρυθός τε καὶ ἀσπίδος, οὐδὲ ἔχει ἔγχος*, Il. 21, 50. So Suidas, *ἀνώμοτος, χωρὶς ὄρκου*.

οὐδενόστωρα (neut. pl.), Il. 8, 178, is a solitary example of a dependent negative compound with a case form in the first member, belonging thus to the class of improper compounds (*παράθετα*). In *οὐτιδανός -ανο-* seems to be a suffix, and *-τιδ-* is perhaps = *τὶ* = Lat. *quid* (Brugmann, Vgl. Gram. 2, 135).

Just as we shall see that by a kind of hyperbole the negative compounds were used in cases where the ancient grammarians attribute to the prefix the sense of *κακόν* or *δλίγον*, so we find that by the figure of understatement, of which the Greeks were rather fond, the compounds in *δνσ-* were sometimes employed where a strictly negative compound would not be improper. So

δυσεξήνυστος δεσμός, Eur. Hipp. 1237; κακῶν γὰρ δυσάλωτος οὐδεὶς, Soph. O. C. 1723; δυσόμοια (= ἀνόμοια) cited from Strattis by Suidas; also δύσαγνος, δύσβατος, δυσνόητος. The use of the negative compounds in hyperbole and the employment of the δυσ- compounds in litotes makes it possible for compounds of either class to do duty as substitutes for those of the other. Cf. the use of Latin *male* in phrases like *statio male fida carinis*, Verg. Aen. 2, 23. The potential force of the verbals in -τος is predominant in their composition with δυσ-, as it is very common in the strictly negative compounds.

Similar is the use of *κακός* in composition; e. g., *κακοτυχής*, Eur. Med. 1274 = ἀτυχής and cf. *κακοτυχῶν*, Thuc., II, 60, 3. Sometimes in the scholia negative compounds are explained by compounds with *κακο-* and *όλιγο-*. So ἀσήμων· *κακοσήμων*, schol. Soph. Ant. 1013; Eustath. on Od. 11, 490, ἄκληρος δὲ ἀνὴρ ὁ ὀλιγόκληρος. Cf. Eustath. on Il. 5, 800, τὸ δὲ ὀλίγον ταῦτόν ἔστι νῦν τῷ ἡττου, αὐτὸ δὲ ἀντὶ τοῦ οὐδαμῶς. So Suidas, sub voc. *όλιγον*, ἀντὶ τοῦ οὐδόλως (οὐδὲ ὅλως).

Compounds with certain prepositions too may be in effect negative. So with *ἀπό*, *ἀπόξενος*, Soph. O. T. 196 = ἀξενος, id. Philoc. 217. Examples are numerous: *ἀπόδειπνος*, *ἀπεργός*, *ἀπόθριξ*, *ἀπόθυμος*, *ἀπόσιτος*, *ἀπόστοργος*, *ἀπότιμος*. Cf. Schmid, Atticismus, 4, 696. *ἀπηλιαστά* (dual), Ar. Av. 110, immediately after *ἡλιαστά*, being a noun immutatum, is an irregular and comic formation made for the sake of the antithesis; cf. on ἀδώτης, p. 23. Examples with *ἐξ* are: *ἐκδικος*, *ἐκνομος*, *ἐκνους*, *ἐκφρων*. So even *παρά*. *ἀνομος* ὁ *παράνομος*, Suidas, sub voc. So *ὑπό* in composition with an adjective has often a minimizing force comparable with that of the diminutive suffix in nouns, as *ὑπόλευκος*, *ὑπόμελας*, *ὑπόπυρρος*, somewhat white, etc., a usage especially common in scientific writers.

Compounds with certain verbal stems as first members are often practically negative. As in the case of other compounds with verbal first member, they are mostly poetic in the classical period. Examples, *φυγοπτόλεμος*, Od. 14, 213, *φυγόμαχος*, Simon. 106; compounds of *λιπο-* are found in tragedy and abound in late Greek, especially in Nonnus, as *λιπόγλωσσος*, *λιποσθενής*, *λιπόσκιος*. So *λυσιμέριμνος* = *ἀμέριμνος* in its sense of ‘driving away care.’

For certain adjective first members equivalent to the negative prefix compare ἐρημόπολις Eur., ἐρημοκόμης Anth. Pal., κένανδρος Aesch., Soph., κενοδοντίς Anth. Pal., κενόσαρκος Et. Mag., μονομάτωρ Eur.

With reference to the derivatives it may be observed that in some few cases the range of usage of a negative verb might overlap that of a denominative verb derived from a negative compound. Thus under some circumstances ἀπιστέω might = *οὐ πείθομαι* and ἀγνοέω might = *οὐ γιγνώσκω*; on the other hand the common *οὐκ ἔθέλων* and *οὐκ ἔθέλω* quite take the place of a negative adjective and its derived verb.

A similar partial coincidence in function is true also in the case of the negative abstract noun and the articular infinitive; but the coincidence is only partial. The articular infinitive is much the more readily productive; it does not, as does often the abstract noun, acquire transferred significations different from that of its verb; the variation in form according to voice and tense makes the meaning of the infinitive more explicit; finally, the infinitive may carry with it a subject and all the verbal modifiers. Cf. Prof. Gildersleeve in Trans. Am. Philological Assn., 1878, p. 18. On the other hand the abstract noun is more implicit and terse; it has more of *σεμνότης*; and, where it is in common use, it is less clumsy than the articular infinitive.

VII. SEMASIOLOGY OF THE NEGATIVE COMPOUNDS.

The simplest and readiest theory for the entrance of the negative into language is the assumption that the negative was originally free and formed a sentence by itself, a phenomenon still not uncommon in Classical Greek; cf. Plat. Phaedr. 236 D. Later by the most primitive sort of parataxis it might come to be used just before or after a positive sentence, thereby negativing the whole. For the effect cf. ὅλοιτο μὲν μή, Eur. Med. 83; also Ar. Aves 1219–20, IP. ποίᾳ γὰρ ἄλλῃ χρὴ πέτεσθαι τοὺς θεούς; ΠΕΙ. οὐκ οἶδα μὰ Δᾶ' ἔγωγε τῆδε μὲν γὰρ οὐ. Cf. too Prof. Gildersleeve's explanation of the origin of *οὐ μή* in independent sentences from the free negative, A. J. P., III, pp. 203–5. A sentence thus

negativated as a whole is simply "the expression of the fact that the attempt to establish a relation between the two ideas has failed," Paul, *Prin. of Lang.* (Eng. trans.), p. 122. This attachment of the negative to the sentence, by which the latter is annulled as a whole, would naturally be followed by the attachment of the negative to some part of the sentence to which the negative particularly applies. Thus the subject may be felt to be the same, while it is the predicate which is altered by the negative, so that the negative finds its way into the predicate. Now if the predicate denotes only an act or state which is somewhat temporary in its nature and which is generally expressed by the verb, the combination of negative and verb is naturally loose and not more permanent than the act or state which is expressed by the verb. The adjective, however,—and this includes the participle in its earlier use,—has more of a characterizing function and expresses a more or less permanent quality or property of the subject. So when the subject is characterized by the absence of a certain quality, an habitual combination of negative and adjective which is used to express this will necessarily become a close compound. Cf. Hartung, *Gr. Partik.* II, p. 74, "So wie diese Negation den Begriff selbst, und Nicht seine Beziehung bestimmt, so kann sie auch körperlich nicht als ein besonderes Wort existiren sondern wird mit dem zu negirenden Worte eine Zusammensetzung bilden müssen." Delbrück, *Vgl. Synt.* II, p. 533, seems to suggest that the negative may have been first used as a prefix with the participle, from whence the usage was extended to adjectives and nouns, but it is hard to see any basis of probability for this. A predicate adjective or noun in a negative sentence without a copula might easily furnish the conditions for starting a compound.

The necessary and sufficient condition for a compound is that the individuality of the component element be lost to the consciousness and the combination itself become the conventional sign for a single notion. When this state of affairs has been reached the compound adjective may become used as an attribute or as a mere epithet. That which denotes the absence of a quality may easily come to denote its contrary and may finally through usage acquire a positive content of its own.

Whether a negative compound shall pass through the inter-

mediate stages between mere negation and a positive content naturally depends very much on the needs and resources of the language. Thus the contrary of *κακός* is pretty well expressed by *ἀγαθός*, so that *ἄκακος* is used as a merely negative word = ‘guileless,’ and if it suggests more than this, we have an instance of litotes; *ἄκακος* never = the simple ‘good.’ *ἀδικος*, however, is regularly opposed to *δίκαιος*, for there is no other word which expresses the contrary of *δίκαιος* so precisely. Again *ἀληθής* has gone a long way from its original negative signification and has acquired a very distinct positive notion of its own.

In a stage of thought and language where there is little occasion to distinguish the negative from the contrary, there would be but little impulse toward the formation of negative compounds and the needs of expression would be satisfied by the primitive pairs of positive adjectives of opposite meaning, as *μέγας μικρός*, *ψυχρός θερμός*. This is a further exemplification of the general principle emphasized by Osthoff in his recent academic address, *Vom Suppletivwesen der Indo-Germanischen Sprachen*, that there is a stage in man’s use of language when his capacity for classification is weak and when differences of tense, gender, degree of comparison, etc., are expressed rather by means of words formed on different roots than by words formed by suffixal or other modifications of the same root. So the use of words radically different to express the two genders of the same species seems to be older than the use of the so-called *substantiva mobilia*; e. g. pairs like *brother* and *sister*, *son* and *daughter*, *horse* and *mare*, are undoubtedly older than formations like *ἀδελφός*, *ἀδελφή*; *filius*, *filia*; *he-goat*, *she-goat*. Words of this class which are material (*stofflich*) rather than formal opposites seem to occur mostly to express the closest of family relationships and the sex of the most familiar of domestic animals. In English we say *bull* and *cow*, but in the case of animals which are not native to British soil or which are less familiar we are apt to resort to mere formal variation of suffix, prefix, or compound to express gender, so *lion*, *lioness*, *bull-buffalo*, *cow-buffalo*, *buck-rabbit*. The same principle holds true of diminutives; thus we say *baby*, *colt*, *puppy*, but *baby-elephant*, *lion-cub*, etc.

To Osthoff's examples of the working of the principle in the defective verbs (so-called), irregularly compared adjectives, sex-words, numerals and pronouns, might be added the expression of qualitative opposites by words from different roots rather than by a word and its formal negative. While a language is still growing and productive in the formation of new words, it has no need to avail itself of the device of the negative compound. Of negative compounds which may fairly be assumed for the pro-ethnic speech, Fick, I. G. Wörterbuch, I, pp. 94 ff., gives only about eighteen, and many of these have a secondary character, as have also the great majority of the compounds in Homer and in Greek generally. Ten of these eighteen words are found in Greek and in almost every one of them the negative force is still very prominent and not easily expressed by a synonym that is positive in form.

The introduction of new negative compounds is doubtless most often due to a desire for precision of expression, for distinguishing between negative and contrary, for expressing the opposite of some new positive adjective for which the language offers no contrary, or for expressing the contrary of one of a pair of original contraries which have shifted their meaning so that their original polarity is no longer preserved. Doubtless too a certain desire for euphemism in expression or litotes is the cause for the introduction of many negative words, but the consciousness of the figure soon fades away with use. Thus the production of new compounds is often an index of reflectiveness or of an affected striving for precision.

The negative formations seem to have proved so convenient in the growth of the language that they were used as vehicles of expression for ideas which seem to have arisen independently of any formal positive contrary. So *ἀναρχος* can be opposed only by *εὐτακτος* or *κόσμιος*; *ἄμεμπτος* is far more common than *μεμπτός*. *ἀνέλεγκτος* and *ἀνεξέλεγκτος* are not uncommon, while *ἐλεγκτός* is cited only from Hesychius, and so with many verbals in *-tos*.

Rarely we find a positive adjective which seems only a 'pendant' to its negative; e. g. *πήμων*, 'baneful,' Orph. Hymn., opposed to

ἀπήμων, Hom.; *πτήν*, ‘winged,’ Herodian, opposed to *ἀπτήν*, Hom. Cf. the Sanskrit *sura*, ‘god’ by popular etymology from *asura*, ‘demon.’

The tendency of the negative compounds to acquire a contrary or positive content prevents any but a new or unusual compound from being used unmodified in the common Greek figure of litotes. In a new or occasional compound the force of the negative is more strongly felt and the word has not acquired by use a positive notion of its own; so with words belonging to a highly poetic sphere. The litotes can be felt in *ἄκακος*, *ἀμείλιχος*, *ἀλαμπής*, *ἀδόκιμος*; but the examples are not numerous.

The positive content of many of these compounds is shown too by the readiness with which they may form derivatives or extend their inflection into the comparative or superlative degrees. The large number of denominative verbs and derivative nouns is noteworthy and examples of comparison are frequent, as *ἀποτμότατος*, Od. 1, 219, *ἀμαθέστατε*, Ar. Ran. 933, *ἀνοσιώτερον καὶ ἀπιστότερον*, Andoc. 1, 23.

A quite exceptional instance of the reinforcement of the negative prefix by another and independent negative is to be seen in Eur Androm. 745–6, *σκιῷ γὰρ ἀντίστοιχος ὥν φωνὴν ἔχεις | ἀδύνατος οὐδὲν ἄλλο πλὴν λέγειν μόνον*, where the context shows that v. 746 means ‘unable to do aught but speak,’ and *not* ‘feeble in naught but speech,’ which would be the normal interpretation. *ἀδύνατος* is here used like *οὐ δυνατός* and the poet seems to have made the odd experiment of trying to resolve the compound by treating the inseparable prefix as separable and an independent word (cf. p. 36).

In Soph. Ant. 175–7, the negative sense of *ἀμήχανον* justifies the following *πρὸν ἀν* with the subjunctive:

*ἀμήχανον δὲ παντὸς ἀνδρὸς ἐκμαθεῖν
ψυχῆν τε καὶ φρόνημα καὶ γνώμην, πρὸν ἀν
ἀρχαῖς τε καὶ νόμοισιν ἐντριβῆς φανῆ.*

Cf. Eur. I. A. 489–90 and see A. J. P. II, 469; G. M. T. 633.

The Greek name for the common negative prefix was ἄλφα στερητικόν = alpha-privative. Yet cf. Chrysippus ap. Simplic. ad Arist. Cat. ed. Basil. f. 100 Δ, τὸ γὰρ ἀθάνατον στερητικὸν ἔχον τὸ σχῆμα τῆς λέξεως οὐ σημαίνει στέρησιν οὐ γὰρ ἐπὶ πεφυκότος ἀποθνήσκειν, εἴτα μὴ ἀποθνήσκοντος χρώμεθα τῷ ὄντοι . . . καὶ τὸ κακὸν δὲ δηλοῦται πολλάκις, ὡς ἄφωνον ἐλέγομεν τραγῳδὸν τὸν κακόφωνον. καὶ ἀποφάσεις δὲ δηλοῦνται διὰ τῶν στερητικῶν φωνῶν, ὥσπερ τὸ διάφορα, ἀδιάφορα καὶ λυσιτελῆ, ἀλυσιτελῆ. So Choeroboscus, Can. 361, and Et. Mag. 639, 50, ἀμέλει ἡνίκα ἡ α στέρησις μὴ σημαίνει ἐπιβάλλοντος ἀποτυχίαν, τότε ἀντὶ ἀποφάσεως αὐτὴν λέγονται ὡς ἀθάνατος, ἄλογος. Thus it is plain that even the ancients saw that the prefix was not always privative in the strict sense of that word, but was often a mere negation (*ἀπόφασις*) as in ἀδιάφορος, ἀλυσιτελῆς, and so, in a sense, in the mutatum ἀθάνατος. Cf. pp. 6, 33. But the distinction between privation and mere negation is generally outside of language.

Again we have a sort of hyperbole when ἄφωνος is used of a bad actor, ἀκάρδιος of a coward, ἄπλευρος of a man with weak lungs, ἀμαθῆς of a man of little learning. Cf. Lobeck, Path. Gr. Serm., I, p. 29, where Choeroboscus and Theodosius are quoted as follows: τὸ ἄλφα ἐπτὰ σημαίνει στέρησιν ὡς ἄφιλος, ἐπίτασιν ὡς τὸ ἄξυλος ὕλη, ὁμοῦ ὡς ἄλοχος καὶ ἀδελφός, κακὸν ὡς τὸ ἄφωνος ὁ κακόφωνος, ὀλίγον ὡς ἀμαθῆς ὁ ὀλιγομαθῆς, ἄθροισιν ὡς τὸ ἄπας, πλεονασμὸν ὡς τὸ ἄσταφος. It is evident that what the grammarians call *στέρησις*, *κακόν* and *ὀλίγον* belong to our alpha-privative, though the latter two do not at all express the true force of the prefix, but show simply that the negative compounds may be used in hyperbole. On the use of a negative compound to denote what is disagreeable or monstrous, cf. Soph. El. 492, where the scholiast explains ἄλεκτρος by δύσλεκτρος, and Soph. Trach. 1060, ἄγλωσσος, schol. κακόγλωσσος; so ἄμορφον in Cie. ad Att. 7, 8 fin., which Tyrrell translates ‘bad form’; cf. the German *Ungewitter*. This use of the negative prefix has been thought by some to form the connecting link between it and the so-called alpha-intensive, the ἐπίτασις of the grammarians quoted above. Pott, E. F.², I, p. 387, cites ἄγονος, which is glossed by Hesychius with πολύγονος. So Key, Trans.

Philol. Soc., 1865, p. 64, compares *ἀ*-privative and intensive to Latin *male*, which may be privative or intensive according to circumstances. But it is simpler to connect most of the cases of so-called *ἀ*-intensive with the *ἀ*-copulative, the *όμοῦ* and *άθρουσις* of the grammarians.

VIII. THE NEGATIVE COMPOUNDS AS AN ELEMENT OF STYLE.

In the study by us moderns of a language no longer accessible to us through the medium of living speech analytical methods play an important part in assisting our appreciation of the elements of style. The observation from a syntactical and lexical point of view of the development of modes of expression has therefore a certain value in enabling us better to estimate the stylistic character of the various Greek authors.

The consideration of the negative compounds with reference to style falls naturally into two divisions. We may observe, first, the effect upon style which the negative compounds have in common with the compounds in general and, secondly, the stylistic character which is peculiar to the negative compounds.

The creative activity of the users of language in the production of new words is nowhere more apparent than in the coinage of new compounds. The best Greek prose with its characteristic moderation used compounds for the most part to convey some definitely crystallized idea which required a permanent and unitary form for its expression. Thus the compounds were not used in Greek as in Sanskrit prose to give expression to a passing fact or to a merely incidental attribute, but for these the Greek would use the more readily extemporized syntactical combinations of words for which it had abundant facilities, especially in its large use of the participle and the articular infinitive. So the common use in the later Sanskrit of compounds to express a mere occasional complex of ideas makes it impossible to ascribe to a Sanskrit compound that more definite characterizing force which a Greek compound has. We are to recognize then in the use of a new compound by a Greek author a distinct exercise of the creative faculty in language and we should expect to see the compounds

entering the language in those spheres where the creative faculty has the greatest activity. One of these spheres is that of the *ποιητής*, whose function it is to beget new combinations of ideas or at least new expressions for old ones. In using a new compound the poet has a form of expression which is his own creation and which puts the idea in a brief and implicit form. His language thus acquires a *σεμνότης* which is above the level of ordinary speech. This is the *σεμνότης* which is a common characteristic of a nominal as contrasted with a verbal expression ; cf. *σωτὴρ ἵσθι*, Aesch. Ag. 512, *σωτὴρ γενοῦ μοι*, id. Cho. 2, for *σῷζε* and *σῶσόν με* respectively, also Hdt. 7, 139, 3. If the poet uses, as he sometimes does, a compound to designate a particular action or relation, he nevertheless characterizes the subject through this act or relation, and this makes his statement of the fact much more impressive. Aeschylus' *πολυάνορος ἀμφὶ γυναικός*, Ag. 62, characterizes Helen more than any less implicit expression could do. In *σὺ μὲν φθίμενος ἀλαίνεις ἄθαπτος, ἄνυδρος*, Eur. Tro. 1085, the compounds state condition as well as fact ; so *ἄτοκος*, Eur. El. 1127, *ἀγείτων*, ibid. 1130.

The more implicit character of compounds as contrasted with the corresponding syntactical combinations lent itself readily to that striving after vague expression which was characteristic of the dithyramb. The dithyramb was the great '*Tummelplatz*' for all that was bold in the formation of compounds, and tragedy shows traces of its dithyrambic antecedents in its tendency toward fullness and boldness in the use of compounds, especially in the choral parts. The comic poets, as creative as any others, but with a different purpose, either parodied the more serious poets in the use of compounds, or else carried their formations to the extreme of clumsiness for comic effect.

The second great sphere of creativeness in the production of compound words is the language of those who deal with subjects more or less technical. Such are the philosophical and scientific writers, men who must have new terms to describe new conceptions and discoveries. In the endeavor to give accurate expression to new ideas they tax to the utmost the capacities of the language and sometimes do violence to its laws of composition. The negative compounds are especially prominent in these depart-

ments of literature, as for example in many of the writings of the Hippocratean corpus, and we may compare the large use of non- and a- as prefixes in modern technical and scientific writings. A glance at an English dictionary will show how numerous are words like *non-contagious*, *anodyne*, *anaesthetic*, etc. The wonderful fertility of the Greek in evolving new technical terms by composition of elements native to the language, when compared with the barrenness of English in this respect, need occasion no surprise, for it will be remembered that the Greek could not, as does the English, draw for its technical vocabulary on two ancient languages so long the vehicles of science and culture.

While very many of the compounds remained confined in their use to the poetic and technical spheres, others descended to the level of the more ordinary prose. Some of the compounds which appear in ordinary prose are really technical in origin, as when an orator employs a legal expression or an historian a word borrowed from the vocabulary of military science, nor is it surprising if an orator occasionally uses a lofty and perhaps tragic word in the epilogue. In later Greek the poetic or technical feeling of the older types of compounds was largely lost and their use became a part of the language's common stock of expressions, so that there was an approach to the facility of the German in composition, yet never to that of the Sanskrit. The poets, especially in the later periods, made their use of compounds more poetic by multiplying compounds of unusual types; cf., e. g., the large use of compounds like *λιπόσκιος* (= *ᾶσκιος*) in Nounus (cf. p. 34).

The line between the artistic and technical compounds and those of every-day speech it is of course impossible to draw; the technical language or cant of one period may be a part of the popular idiom of the next. The compounds of the poets do not so readily tend to sink to the common level as do the technical words, the former being the creations of art and feeling rather than due like the latter to the necessities of expression. The artistic compounds may be classed with the luxuries, the scientific and technical ones among the necessities of language. It is noticeable that a very large number of the more common compounds, including many negative words, belong to the ethical sphere, a department of

Greek thought in which poetry and philosophy may be said to meet and one where antithesis is particularly frequent.

The form and meaning of the negative compounds lent themselves readily to particular stylistic effects.

This is very noticeable where these compounds are used two or more together. Formally this makes a species of that figure which is variously called alliteration, annomination, *homoeoprophoron*, *parhomoeon*; in Greek ὁμοιόαρκτον, ὁμοιοκάταρκτον, cf. Max. Plan. in Walz, Rhett. Gr., v, 511, 6, 551, 4. Doubtless the full sound which belongs to the vowel *a* gives it a phonetic effectiveness suited to pathetic situations. Here, however, the figure resides in the sense as well as in the sound, and we have really a species of anaphora. Now a negative compound characterizes its subject, as the name *a-στερητικόν* implies, by attributing to it a deprivation or lack of something and, if this something be one of the chief objects of human interest or desire, the privation connotes feeling and the compound has necessarily a pathetic or drastic character, the effect of which is heightened by repetition. So Il. 9, 63-4,

ἀφρίγτωρ ἀθέμιστος ἀνέστιός ἐστιν ἐκεῖνος,
ὅς πολέμου ἔραται ἐπιδημίου ὀκρυόεντος,

where the effect is made greater, as often, by the asyndeton; cf. Od. 1, 242, *οἴχετ' ἄϊστος ἄπυστος*. So also Il. 2, 201, ἀπτόλεμος καὶ ἄναλκις, and the same combination in Il. 9, 35 and 41; Simon. 36 (51), *οὐδὲ . . . ἅπονον οὐδ' ἄφθιτον οὐδ' ἀκίνδυνον βίον | ἐσ γῆρας ἐξίκοντο τελέσσαντες*. For such expressions of a more felicitous character note the frequent combination, ἀγήραον ἀθανάτην τε, Il. 2, 447, et al.

This figure is a great favorite with the tragic poets. Next to the π -alliterations the *a*-alliterations are the most numerous in the plays of the three great tragedians and, as is the case with alliteration generally, a considerable majority of the cases occur in the lyric parts. Many of these instances of *a*-alliteration are due to the massing of the privative compounds, though the alliteration is sometimes extended by the addition of other words beginning with *a*. See Riedel, Alliteration bei den drei grossen

griechischen Tragikern, diss., Erlangen, 1900. Examples are : ἄχορον ἀκίθαριν"Αρη, Aesch. Supp. 681; ἄμαχον, ἀπόλεμον, ἀνίερον, id. Ag. 769; cf. Cho. 55; ἄκλαντος, ἄφιλος, ἀνυμέναιος ἔρχομαι τὰν πυμάταν ὁδόν, Soph. Ant. 876; ibid. 29, 1071; "Αἰδος ὅτε Μοῖρ' ἀνυμέναιος | ἀλυρος ἄχορος ἀναπέφηνε, id. O. C. 1221; cf. ibid. 1236-7; ἄπαις τε κάγύναιξ κάνεστιος, id. frag. 4 N.; ἀνάδελφος, ἀπάτωρ, ἄφιλος, Eur. Or. 310; ἄγαμος, ἄτεκνος, ἄπολις, ἄφιλος, id. Iph. T. 220; ἄθεον, ἀνομον, ἄδικον, id. Bacch. 995. So Ar. Ran. 204 is doubtless paratragedy : κἀτα πῶς δυνήσομαι | ἀπειρος ἀθαλάττωτος, ἀσαλαμίνιος | ὥν, εἴτ' ἐλαύνειν, cf. Vespr. 729-30, and Phrynicus, fragg. 18, 19 κ (π, pp. 587, 592 μ). For the orators cf. Antiphon, 1, 22, ἀθέμιστα καὶ ἀνόσια καὶ ἀτέλεστα καὶ ἀνήκουστα ; in the Palamedes ascribed to Gorgias, 36, δεινὸν ἄθεον ἄδικον ἀνομον ἔργον, recalling Eur. Bacch. 995, quoted above ; Demos. 25, 52, ἀλλ' ἀσπειστος, ἀνίδρυτος, ἄμικτος, οὐ χάριν, οὐ φιλίαν, οὐκ ἀλλ' οὐδὲν ὃν ἀνθρωπος μέτριος γιγνώσκων ; cf. Lys. 12, 82. So Plat. Phaedr. 240 α, ἄγαμον ἄπαιδα ἄοικον. The frequency of the phenomenon in the English poets has long been a subject of remark. Two stock examples are, "unwept, unhonored and unsung," Scott, Lay of the Last Minstrel, 6, 1, 16, and "unhousel'd, disappointed, unaneled," Shak. Hamlet, 1, 5, 77. The large use of negative words is thus often a mark of an elevated style ; cf. remarks hereafter on their use in Antiphon.

As in some of the examples given above, the compounds are frequently massed in threes. Whether we are to see in this fact any connection with three as a sacred number and hence with the threefold repetition common in old religious poetry and formulae is doubtful. The compounds occur very often in pairs and occasionally in a series of four or more. Yet cf. Karl Frey, Homer, progr. Bern, 1881, p. 31, "Die Dreizahl ist in der Kunst eine feierliche Form. Und ihre Verwendung ist unendlich. Und im Grossen und im Kleinen wird sie angewendet ; drei Epitheta sind ein beliebter Redeschmuck, und der griechische Tragiker theilte sein grosses Festspiel ein in drei Acte ; est ist eine Trilogie. Auch die greichische Komödie beruht auf der Dreizahl, insofern zwei Parabasen die Handlung trennen ; auch sie ist eine Trilogie."

This whole subject belongs to the great chapter of reduplication in language. A different phenomenon is the Greek fondness for reinforcing one negative by another one or more as in Plat. Phaedo, 78 D, *οὐδέποτε οὐδαμῆ οὐδαμῶς ἀλλοίωσιν οὐδεμίαν ἐνδέχεται*; for a reinforcement of the privative prefix by another negative see p. 39.

Another form of reduplication is the *figura etymologica*, a figure which doubtless had its beginnings in the oldest popular poetry and which survived in tragedy, and was used occasionally by most of the orators. With some negative compounds where the negative or privative force is still very strong we have what we may call a cognate genitive, but cognate only with the second member of the compound, e. g., *ἄφιλος φίλων*, Eur. Hel. 524; *τέκεα πατρὸς ἀπάτορα*, id. Her. Fur. 114; *τοῦ ἡδίστου ἀκούσματος ἀνήκοος εἰ καὶ τοῦ ἡδίστου θεάματος ἀθέατος*, Xen. Mem. 2, 1, 31; *τιμῆς ἄτιμος πάσης*, Plat. Legg. 6, 774 B; *ἄπαις ἀρρένων παιδῶν*, Andoc. 1, 117; cf. Xen. Cyr. 4, 6, 2. The genitive is generally limited by an adjective. So in the rhetorical use of the cognate accusative in the orators we have a host of examples of *ἀδίκημα ἀδικεῖν*, but here the negative force is perhaps hardly present to the consciousness. A combination of *figura etymologica* and antithesis is often possible with the negative compounds, e. g., Aristarch. Trag. frag. 2 n, *καὶ τὸν ἀσθενῆ σθένειν | τίθησι καὶ τὸν ἄπορον εὐρίσκειν πόρον*.

There was developed in Greek a form of the *figura etymologica*, a peculiar type of oxymoron, which created for itself a special set of negative compounds. The earliest example of the use of this form of expression is in Od. 18, 73, *Ίρος* "Αἴρος, where the compound seems obviously formed for the purpose of the word-play. We may compare *Δύσπαρις*, Il. 3, 39, and *Κακοῖλιον*, Od. 19, 260. The Homeric *Ίρος* "Αἴρος is followed by more than a score of similar expressions in later authors, chiefly the tragedians, as Aesch. Pers. 680, *νᾶες ἄναες*, et al.

Ίρος "Αἴρος has usually been intrepreted to mean 'Irus, who is no longer Irus,' and so *νᾶες ἄναες = νᾶες οὐ νᾶες οὖσαι*. Yet Froehde, Bezz. Beitr. 20, 216, would read *ἄνιρος* = Sanskrit *avīras*, 'unmanly.' Curious indeed it would be if a chance pun of the epic poet had furnished the model and authorization for the

rather numerous brood of later imitations, which, however, are not puns but examples of the *figura etymologica*. Some, as Curtius, Gr. Gram., § 360, and Wheeler, Der Gr. Nominalaccent, p. 46, have inclined to look upon these negative formations as immutata and they were perhaps influenced by the analogy of the Sanskrit negative noun immutata. The accent in the Greek words does not seem decisive in one way or the other. Brugmann, Vgl. Gram., II, 1, p. 89, considers them to be on the border line between adjective and noun and takes refuge in the statement that the distinction between adjective and noun is not a thoroughgoing one in the Indo-European languages. Lobeck, Paralipomena, 229 ff., argues stoutly in favor of taking them as adjectives. A case like *νύμφη* ἄνυμφον (v. l. -ῆ), Eur. Hec. 612, if the common reading is correct, favors this view, otherwise one might expect *ἀ-νυμφη. So *ψυχὴ* ἄψυχος, Ar. Ran. 1334, and *μήτηρ* ἀμήτωρ, Soph. El. 1154, where otherwise *ἀψυχη and *ἀμητηρ might have been expected. The change in ending undoubtedly helped the feeling of change in part of speech. As has been shown already (p. 22), all Greek analogy is against the combination of the negative prefix with nouns to form nouns, and when this occurs in Sanskrit, the ending generally suffers no change, so from *vaçā*, cow, is made *avaçā*, non-cow. The true parallel to this last in Greek is found in expressions like *γυναῖκα οὐ γυναῖκα*, Soph. O. T. 1256; cf. the popular riddle in Bergk-Hiller-Crusius, Anthol. Lyr., p. 131 :

Αἶνός τίς ἐστιν, ως ἀνήρ τε κούκ ἀνήρ
ὅρνιθα κούκ ὅρνιθ' ἵδων τε κούκ ἵδῶν
ἐπὶ ξύλου τε κού κ ξύλου καθημένην
λίθῳ τε κού λίθῳ βάλοι τε κού βάλοι.

So in Latin, imitations of the Greek figure are not precisely similar formations, but employ either negative adverb + noun, or else a clearly adjectival formation, as *funera nec funera*, Catull. 64, 83, *insepulta sepultura*, Cic. Phil. 1, 2, 5 = *τάφοι ἄταφοι*. So these formations must, I think, be looked upon as adjectives and hence mutata. The mutatum *ἄπαις*, meaning 'one who is no child,' must of course be distinguished from the more common mutatum, *ἄπαις*, meaning 'childless.'

These compounds, as is shown alike by the range of literature in which they appear and by the striking figure in which they are employed, are quite artificial and artistic formations, perhaps, as suggested above, modelled on a misunderstood Homeric pun, and the examples are numerous enough to show that they were a part of the regular stock of figurative expression belonging to Greek tragedy. The figure in its unmodified form is rare in classical prose; a few examples have been noted in the prose of the later period.

The following examples of the figure have been collected : **Ipos *Aīpos*, Od. 18, 73; *νᾶες ἄναες*, Aesch. Pers. 680; *ἄχαρις χάρις*, id. Prom. 544, Ag. 1545 (cf. *χάριν ἀχάριτον*, Cho. 42); *ἀπόλεμος πόλεμος*, Prom. 904; *νόμον ἄνομον*, id. Ag. 1142; *ἄπολιν πόλιν*, id. Eum. 457; *παῖδες ἄπαιδες*, id. Eum. 1034; *ἄδωρα δῶρα*, Soph. Aj. 665; *μήτηρ ἀμήτωρ*, id. El. 1154; *ἄγαμον γάμον*, id. O. T. 1214: *ύπνος ἄϋπνος*, id. Phil. 848 (cf. *ἄσκον εἰσοίκησιν*, Phil. 534); *πότμον ἄποτμον*, Eur. Phoen. 1306, Hipp. 1144; *νύμφην ἄνυμφον*, *παρθένον ἀπάρθενον*, id. Hec. 612; *ἀπόλεμον πόλεμον*, id. H. F. 1133; *δεσμὸν ἄδεσμον*, id. Suppl. 32; *χάριν ἄχαριν*, id. Iph. T. 566 (cf. Phoen. 1757); *δάκρυν ἄδακρυν*, id. Iph. T. 832 (dub. lect.); *όδοὺς ἀνόδους*, id. Iph. T. 888; *γάμον ἄγαμον*, id. Hel. 690 (cf. Phoen. 1047); cf. *ά δὲ μεγαλόπολις ἄπολις ὅλωλεν Τροία*, id. Tro. 1291; *ψυχὴ ἄψυχος*, Ar. Ran. 1334 (Aesch. loq.); *ἀδεὲς δέος*, Plat. Symp. 198 A; *πόλις ἄπολις* (pred.), id. Legg. 766 D; *βίος ἄβιος*, Leon. Tar. Anth. Pal. 7, 715, 3; *χάρις ἄχαρις*, id. ibid. 9, 322, 2; *κόσμος ἄκοσμος*, Jul. Aeg. ibid. 7, 561, Antip. Sid. ibid. 9, 323, Epigr. Gr. 365; *κῆπος ἄκηπος*, Greg. Naz. (v. Thesaur.); *δεῖπνος ἄδειπνος*, Nonn. 17, 51; *κόσμος ἄκοσμος*, id. 6, 371; *οἶκος ἄσκοις*, id. 17, 42. It will be noted how a number of the expressions are repeated and seem to have become a part of the literary tradition of the language.

The effect of this bold figure is to show that the object to which the epithet is applied contradicts its own true nature and so belies its name. The force of these expressions may be highly pathetic and their use is out of place except in the most impassioned speech. *ψυχὴ ἄψυχος*, Ar. Ran. 1334, is put into the mouth of Aeschylus, and the fact that the figure is thus used

in travesty shows that it was a recognized element of tragic diction.

There are a number of examples of equivalent oxymora which are not however precisely parallel in form; e. g., *μῆτερ ἐμὴ δύναμητερ*, Od. 23, 97; *ἄπορα πόριμος*, Aesch. Prom. 904; *θέλγοις ἀν ἄθελκτον*, id. Suppl. 1056; *ἄτλητα τλάσσα*, id. Ag. 407; *ῆκουσ' ἀνήκουστα*, Soph. El. 1407; *φῶς ἀφεγγές*, id. O. C. 1549; *γάμους δυσγάμους*, Eur. Phoen. 1047; *ἀνηφαίστω πυρί*, id. Or. 621; *πίστιν τῶν ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἀπιστοτάτην*, Andoc. 1, 67; *μηδὲ τὰς χάριτας ἀχαρίστως χαριζόμενος* [Isoc.], 1, 31: *ἀβίωτος βίος*, Philemon, frag. 90, 7; 93, 7 κ. (87, 90 μ.), and freq.; cf. Antiphon, tetral. B, β, 10.

Aristotle in the chapter of his Rhetoric on *ὅγκος*, III, 6, 7, 1408 a, teaches that it is advantageous to describe a thing by the qualities which it does not possess,—*ἔξ ὅν μὴ ἔχει λέγειν*. ‘For thus,’ he says, ‘the amplification may be carried to infinity,’—*αὕξεται γὰρ οὕτως εἰς ἄπειρον*. He continues: *ἔστι δὲ τοῦτο καὶ ἐπὶ ἀγαθῶν καὶ κακῶν, ὅπως οὐκ ἔχει, ὑποτέρως ἀν ἦ χρήσιμον. ὅθεν καὶ τὰ ὄνόματα οἱ ποιηταὶ φέρουσι, τὸ ἄχορδον καὶ τὸ ἄλυρον μέλος· ἐκ τῶν στερήσεων γὰρ ἐπιφέρουσιν εὐδοκιμεῖ γὰρ τοῦτο ἐν ταῖς μεταφοραῖς λεγόμενον ταῖς ἀνάλογον, οἷον τὸ φάναι τὴν σάλπιγγα εἶναι μέλος ἄλυρον*. The figure thus belongs to Aristotle’s class of proportional metaphors, *μεταφορὰ ἐκ τοῦ ἀνάλογον*. In Rhet. 3, 11, 11, 1412 b, fin., Aristotle gives another example: *τόξον* (sc. *ἔστι*) *φόρμιγξ ἄχορδος*, cf. Theogn. Trag. frag. 1 n.; so in the example in Poet. 21, 15, the shield is called *φιάλη Ἀρεως* or *φιάλη ἄουνος*; in Aesch. Sept. 82, the dust (*κόνις*) is called *ἄναυδος ἄγγελος*. See Cope, Arist. Rhet. ad locc. The following proportions may illustrate the character of the figure:

$$\begin{aligned} \tauόξον : \nuευρά, \text{ bowstring (omitted term)} \\ &\quad = \phi\acute{\rho}μιγξ : \chiορδή, \text{ lyrestring;} \\ \kappaόνις : \text{its appearance (omitted term)} \\ &\quad = \ddot{\alpha}\gammaγελος : αύδή. \end{aligned}$$

This device is often employed by the poets and gives a special sphere for the use of the negative compounds. Examples abound

in the tragedians, as ἄπτερος φάτις, Aesch. Ag. 276 (cf. ἔπεα πτερόεντα); the scent of blood is μηνυτὴρ ἄφθεγκτος, id. Eum. 245; the eagles are Ζηνὸς ἀκραγεῖς (v. l. ἀκλάγγεις) κύνες, id. Prom. 803; the sting of the gad-fly is ἄρδις ἄπυρος, ‘a barb not wrought with fire,’ ibid. 880; the Pleiades are called ἄπτεροι πελειάδες, Aesch. frag. 312 n.; midnight is ἀσάλπικτος ὥρα, Soph. frag. 357 n.; an animal’s hide is ἀσπάθητος χλαῖνα, id. frag. 793 n. So κῶμον ἀναυλότατον, Eur. Phoen. 791; αἰδοῦς ἀχαλκεύτοισιν ἔζευκται πέδαις, id. frag. 595 n.

Antithesis is a figure native to the Greek, and expressions like the negative compounds, which have an opposition in their very nature, are very readily employed in such a figure. Antitheses of this kind, where two expressions are opposed not only in meaning but also in form, afford besides a species of paronomasia. Cf. p. 46. In the ethical and philosophical sphere such pairs of negative compounds or derivatives with their positives are of very frequent occurrence, but much less often is the antithesis a rhetorical one. Expressions like: περὶ τῶν δικαίων καὶ τῶν ἀδίκων, Isoer. 15, 255; τοὺς ἀτίμους ἐπιτίμους ποιῆσαι, Andoc. 1, 109, are too simple and unavoidable to be considered as conscious elements of style, though their very common occurrence would be an index of an author’s cast of mind. More rhetorical is the balancing in ἔργον δ’ οὐδὲν ὅνειδος, ἀεργή δέ τ’ ὅνειδος, Hes. Op. 311; δώτη μέν τις ἔδωκεν, ἀδώτη δ’ οὐ τις ἔδωκε, ibid. 355; πᾶς τις πλούσιον ἄνδρα τίει, ἀτίει δέ πενιχρόν, Theognis 621 (in the latter two examples the antithesis accounts for the anomalous forms, ἀδώτη, ἀτίει, see pp. 19, 23); Gorg., Palamedes, 30, ἐποίησε τὸν ἀνθρώπινον βίον πόριμον ἐξ ἀπόρου καὶ κεκοσμημένον ἐξ ἀκόσμου. So οὕτω οὖτε ήμῖν αἴτιοι ἔξουσι δούλιον ζυγὸν οὖτε ἀναίτιοι, Hdt. 7, 8, 3; προαιρουμένων μέτριον βίον μετὰ δικαιοσύνης μᾶλλον ἡ μέγαν πλούτον μετ’ ἀδίκιας, Isoer. 8, 93; εἰ τοὺς μὲν ἡδικηότας τιμωρίας ἀφεῖναι κύριαι γένουντο, ἐφ’ ήμῖν δὲ τοῖς εὐπεποιηκόσιν ἄκυροι κατασταθεῖεν, id. 18, 68.

Here belongs mention of the negative compounds as used in the σχῆμα κατ’ ἄρσιν καὶ θέσιν, the figure by which both the negative and positive form of expression are used together for the same thing. This is a favorite usage in the older literature; see Bekker, *Homerische Blätter*, II, 222. Rehdantz, Ind. Dem.

Phil. sub voc. *ἀρσις*, distinguishes the two cases, where the negative expression precedes and where it follows. The former is a case of litotes followed by its antithetical positive to guard against a misunderstanding, as in *οὐ νῆις ἀέθλων . . . ἀλλ' ἐν πρώτοισιν ὅιω ἔμμεναι*, Od. 8, 179; *οὐκ ἄκλητοι, παρακληθέντες δέ*, Thuc. 6, 87, 2; *οὐκ ἀφρόνως ἀλλὰ νοῦν ἔχόντως*, Isoer. Ep. 5, 2. This sort of antithesis is frequent in Antiphon, e. g., *οὐδὲ ἀφανῆς ἀλλὰ καὶ λίαν φανερός*, tetral. B, γ, 7; *οὕτε . . . στια ἀλλ' ἀνόσι' ἀν πάθοιμεν*, ibid. 11; cf. Blass, Attische Beredsamkeit², I, 143.

The case where the negative follows is somewhat different, for here the first expression logically includes the second. *Δίκαιος* necessarily implies *οὐκ ἄδικος*, but the converse is not true. Examples are: *ἔοικέ τοι, οὐ τοι ἀεικές*, Il. 9, 70; *γνῶ ρ' οὐδὲ ἡγνοίησε*, Hes. Theog. 551; *σοφίη . . . , οὐκ ἀγνωμοσύνῃ*, Hdt. 2, 172; *γνωτὰ κούκ ἀγνωτα*, Soph. O. T. 58; *ἐκόντα κούκ ἄκοντα*, ibid. 1230, conversely, *ἄκοντα καὶ μὴ ἐκόντα*, Lys. 13, 19; *ῶσπερ ἀπορίας οὔσης . . . ἀλλ' οὐ πολλῆς ἀφθονίας ὑπαρχούσης*, Isocr. 12, 90. Such is often the force of litotes that an adjectival expression with the double negative is stronger than that of the opposite positive; thus rhetorically the effect is a climax; cf. Gildersleeve, note on Justin Martyr, I, 22, 10.

Litotes, the figure of understatement, often appears in the form of a merely negative expression of that which could be more truly expressed positively. As has been shown already, the negative compounds in common use could seldom be used alone in this figure. Ordinarily, for instance, the use of the term *ἀσεβής* would be no litotes at all, for the word has by use acquired a positive content which makes it the proper contrary, not the mere negative, of *εὐσεβής*. One might well suppose that *ἀσεβής*, when first used, if applied to a downright opponent of the worship of the gods, might be felt as a true instance of litotes.

But it is coupled with the negative adverb that these words appear so frequently used in litotes; indeed it is probably true that litotes in Greek is much more frequent with negative adjectives than with positive and that some negative words are used only in this figure. The reason for this is doubtless that the positive adjectives in common use are more numerous than the

negative, and since this form of litotes consists in negativing the opposite of the word which would be used in simple direct statement, we should expect the opposites of the more common adjectives to predominate here and not the common adjectives themselves.

The force of the figure seems to lie partly in the suggestion of reserve on the side of the speaker or writer and partly in the fact that the hearer or reader is compelled to make for himself the true judgment which the language used does not state but only implies, so that the thought becomes more a part of his own thinking. This latter fact accounts largely for the great force in general of the implicit in expression, a phenomenon already noticed in connection with the use of compounds.

The figure is very common in Greek from Homer down. Cf. the Homeric *οὐκ ἄφρων*, *οὐκ ἀέκων*, *οὐδὲ ἀπίθησε*, *οὐ τοι δεικές*, *οὐ . . . ἀκληγεῖς*. *ἀμελέω* is always used with a negative in Homer. The figure is not so common in prose as in poetry, but it is absent from no department of the literature; cf. *οὐκ ἄδηλον*, Antiphon, 1, 13; *οὐκ ἀτιμώρητος*, id. tetral. B, δ, 8.

The poets sometimes increase the phonetic impressiveness of their compounds by adding an element which, while making greater the number of syllables, contributes little to the sense, so that the result hardly differs in force from a simple negative compound. So for the simple negative prefix a negative adjective is sometimes substituted, e. g. *ἄιδροδίκης*, Pind., and many with *ἀπειρο-*, as *ἀπειρόγαμος*, Eubul. Com. frag. 35, *ἀπειρόδακρυς*, Aesch., *ἀπειρομάχης*, Pind., *ἀπειροπόλεμος*, Dion. H., *ἀπειρότοκος*, Antip. Sid. in Anth. Pal. and many in late writers; so Hesych. *ἀπόλεμος* *ἀπειροπόλεμος*. Similar are some compounds in *ἀφιλο-* particularly affected by Cyril of Alexandria, e. g. *ἀφιλόθεος* and *ἀφιλόκομπος*, hardly different in force from *ἄθεος* and *ἄκομπος*. Again a final element is sometimes added which, while formally the second member of a bi-membral compound, is hardly more than a mere suffix in force. The phenomenon is frequent in the language of Aeschylus and may belong to the solemn diction of the old religious poetry. Cf. such series of names of divinities as: "Εκατος (Apollo), 'Εκάεργος, 'Εκηβόλος, 'Εκατηβόλος; 'Αρίστη (Artemis), 'Αριστοβούλη,

'Αριστομάχη, (Usener's Götternamen, pp. 49 f.; A. J. P. xvii, 357-8.) In the case of the negative compounds those which have an active sense are occasionally extended, mostly in late Greek, by being again compounded with *-ποιός*, *-πραγής*, or *-εργός*. So ἀφοβοποιός, schol. Aesch. = ἄφοβος, Aesch. Prom. 902; ἀδικοπραγής, Stob. nearly = ἄδικος; so ἀθεμιτουργός, Eccl., ἀθέμιτος; ἀνοστουργός, Aristotle, Ep. Plat., ἀνόσιος.

IX. HISTORY OF THE FORMATION OF NEGATIVE COMPOUNDS IN GREEK.

As we have seen, the Greek negative prefix is the formal equivalent of the corresponding element in the original pro-ethnic speech, and it is an interesting question, but one hardly to be satisfactorily answered, how many of the pro-ethnic negative compounds the Greek inherited and preserved. Fick in his Wörterbuch der Indogermanischen Sprachen,⁴ I, pp. 85 f., gives a list of 10 such words, ἀνιππος, ἀναγής, ἀνυδρος, ἀκυρος, ἀγνωτος, ἀμβροτος, ἀπονος, ἀνάφατος, ἄφθιτος, ἄπνυος. Such a list has some slight value but must not be accepted as at all certain. In the case of such a productive type of formation it is very possible that two or more individual languages may have combined phonetically equivalent elements quite independently. Again, some of the old words may have survived in a single language only or the form may have become altered in one or more of the languages owing to analogical influences. A comparison of the phrase *κλέφος ἄφθιτον*, Il. 9, 413, with the Sanskrit *gravas aksitam* gives strong proof of the high antiquity of *ἄφθιτος*, and the retention of the *μ* in *ἀμβροτος* marks the compound as old. Fick compares *ἀβροτησιος with the Zend *ameretāt*.

It is unquestionably true that the readiness with which new compounds were made in the Greek language and the types of formation which were prevalent varied much in the different periods of the language and the different spheres of the literature in which they were employed.

The following tables are the result of an attempt to determine the growth in the use of the negative compounds and derivatives as far as is shown by the emergence of *new* words with the development of the literature. To undertake to examine the text of the various authors with reference to the use which they made of the negative compounds, new and old, would carry us beyond the limits of this dissertation:

It cannot be claimed for the following tables that they are beyond the need of revision. With the exception of a few additions, notably words from the new Bacchylides, the tables include only the words found in Liddell and Scott's lexicon. To ascertain the first occurrence of the words in the literature Stephanus' Thesaurus has been used. The corpus of inscriptions has not been taken into account except in the instances where a word is cited only from inscriptions, and there is a possibility of error in the uncertainty as to the genuine and spurious portions of the Hippocratean corpus. There are included, too, a few of the inevitable cases of doubtful date and etymology. Absolute accuracy in such a set of figures is perhaps hardly to be thought of. The main outlines, however, of the tendencies of the language are made clear and can be given so satisfactorily in no other way.

Our collection of the negative compounds is more complete than the one included in the general lists of Greek compounds made by Schroeder in his book "Ueber die formelle Unterscheidung der Redetheile," pp. 198 ff. A collection of the Latin compounds and derivatives containing *in*-privative has been made by F. L. Vicol, Programm des Gr.-Or. Obergymnasiums in Suczawa, 1890 and 1891.

TABLE I.

Showing the emergence of new negative words in the literature by classes and by authors, periods, or departments. See classification on p. 16. The column headed *m* includes anomalous forms which could not be otherwise classified.

	<i>a</i> -priv. + adjective or participle, exc. verbs in <i>-τος</i> .	<i>a</i> -priv. + verbal in <i>-τος</i> .	<i>a</i> -priv. + other participles.	<i>a</i> -priv. + noun.	Mutata of <i>a</i> -priv. + noun, also so-called synthetica.	Negative word as one member of a larger compound.	<i>h</i>	<i>i</i>	<i>j</i>	<i>k</i>	<i>l</i>	<i>m</i>	Tot.
	<i>ac</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>c</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>ef</i>	<i>g</i>							
Indo-European (?), v. Fick..	1	4		5									10
Homer.....	13	71	(5)	84	6	17	4	10	19	2	226		
Hesiod.....	6	15	(1)	11	1	3		1				39	
Early elegiac and iambic poetry.....	5	11		17		6		1			1	41	
Homeric hymns and later epic.....	2	11		10	1	3				1	28		
Early melic poetry before 500 b. c.....	2	11		17	1		1	2	3		37		
Frags. early hist., phil., com. before 500 b. c.....		11		3		4			2		20		
Aeschylus.....	13	56		46	6	13		3	6		143		
Aeschylus and Pindar.....	1	8		9		2	1				21		
Pindar and Bacchylides.....	3	15		12	11	6		1			48		
Total before 500 b. c.....	45	210	(6)	209	26	53	6	18	31	3	603		
Attic philos. and tech. lit. exc. Plat. Aristot. and Hippocr.....					2	2	7		1	3		38	
Sophocles.....	3	20			2								
Euripides.....	10	43			52	3	4		2	9		123	
Tragic fragg.....	8	35			36	5	12			4		100	
Herodotus.....	1	1			2							3	
Hippocrates.....	6	13			14		13	1	1	5		53	
Historians, lesser and lost....	10	34		3	42	1	40	2		17	1	150	7
Old Com. fragg.....	2	14		1	2		2		1	3	1	53	
Aristophanes.....	3	15		1	6	3	7	2	1	3		39	
Antiphon.....	1	10		1	2		6		2			22	
Andocides.....		1			1			3	1			3	
Thucydides.....	5	28			6				4	2		48	
Lysias.....		5			3				2	1		11	

TABLE I (Continued).

	<i>ac</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>c</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>ef</i>	<i>g</i>	<i>h</i>	<i>i</i>	<i>k</i>	<i>l</i>	<i>m</i>	Tot.
Isocrates.....		5					3		1			9
Istaeus.....	2	2					1					5
Plato.....	8	51	(1)	1	27	1	37	1	4	7		137
Xenophon.....	3	30			11	1	6		2	4		57
Aeschines.....		6			2		1			1		10
Demosthenes.....	1	11			2		3	3				20
Hypereides.....		2			2	1	2					7
Aristotle.....	15	69			30	2	34	4	2	11		167
Middle and New Comedy....	1	5			4	3	5	1				19
Total Attic period.....	78	402	(1)	7	264	27	193	15	23	70	2	1081
Alexandrian poetry.....	2	29			31	4	4	7	2			79
Alexandrian prose.....	15	84		1	39	3	37			25		204
Total Alexandrian period....	17	113		1	70	7	41	7	2	25		283
Roman period, exc. eccl. and technical.....	66	214		3	83	20	81	8	13	28	2	518
Early Byzantine period (330-622 A. D.), secular lit.....	15	50		1	27	10	14	2	5	3	1	128
Roman and Early Byz. periods, eccl. lit.....	57	250	(2)	1	51	34	73	2	5	35		508
Later Byzantine lit.....	13	62			17	16	26	1	1	9	1	146
Anth. Pal.....	3	19	(1)		24	3	3			1		53
Oracles.....	2	3			6	3	2					16
Inscriptions.....	3	12			3	1	5		1	3		28
Math. and Astron.....	3	7			3	3	2		1	1		20
Medical lit.....	14	64			15	3	10			6		112
Rhetores, grammarians, schools, lexica, etc.....	34	216			107	22	55	8	25	43	1	511
Total Byzantine, eccl., technical lit., etc.....	144	683	(3)	2	253	95	190	13	38	101	3	1522
Uncertain.....	2	9			4	2	3			2		22
Grand total.....	352	1631	(10)	15	883	177	561	49	94	257	10	4029

TABLE II (Summary of Table I).

Literature before 500 b. c....	45	210	(6)	2	209	26	53	6	18	31	3	603
Attic literature after 500 b.c.	78	402	(1)	7	264	27	193	15	23	70	2	1081
Alexandrian literature.....	17	113		1	70	7	41	7	2	25		283
Literature of Roman period, exc. eccl. and technical....	66	214		3	83	20	81	8	13	28	2	518
Byzantine, eccl. and technical lit.....	144	683	(3)	2	253	95	190	13	38	101	3	1522
Uncertain.....	2	9			4	2	3			2		22
Grand total.....	352	1631	(10)	15	883	177	561	49	94	257	10	4029

TABLE III.

Showing percentage of new negative words by classes in various groups of authors.

	<i>ac</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>ef</i>	<i>g</i>	<i>h</i>	<i>i</i>	<i>k</i>	<i>l</i>	<i>m</i>	
Indo-European (?), Fick....	.100	.400		.500							=1.000
Early Epic and Lyric.....	.075	.321	.005	.375	.024	.078	.013	.038	.062	.008	
Frags. early hist., philos. and com.550		.150		.200			.100		
Aesch., Pind. and Bacchylides.....	.080	.373		.316	.080	.099	.005	.019	.028		
Before 500 b.c.075	.348	.003	.347	.043	.088	.010	.030	.051	.005	
Attic philos. and technical lit., exc. Plat. and Aristot.	.079	.526		.053	.053	.184		.026	.079		
Soph., Eur. and tragic frags.	.080	.350		.398	.035	.071		.009	.058		
Herodotus.....	.113	.245		.264		.245	.019	.019	.094		
Hippocrates.....	.067	.227	.020	.280	.007	.267	.013		.013	.007	
Historians, lesser and lost...		.286	.143	.286		.286					
Comedy, Old, Middle and New054	.306	.009	.252	.099	.171	.027	.018	.054	.009	
Thucydides.....	.104	.583		.125		.063		.083	.042		
Orators.....	.046	.483	.011	.138	.011	.184	.034	.057	.034		
Plato.....	.058	.372	.007	.197	.007	.270	.007	.029	.051		
Xenophon.....	.053	.526		.193	.018	.105		.035	.070		
Aristotle090	.413		.180	.012	.204	.024	.012	.066		
Attic lit. after 500 b. c....	.072	.372	.006	.244	.025	.179	.014	.021	.065	.002	
Alexandrian lit.....	.060	.399	.004	.247	.025	.145	.025	.007	.088		
Lit. of Roman period, exc. eccl. and technical.....	.108	.459	.004	.135	.047	.151	.011	.021	.062	.002	
Byzantine and ecclesiasti- cal.....	.131	.414	.004	.140	.087	.146	.068	.015	.051	.004	
Anth. Pal.....	.057	.358		.453	.057	.057				.019	
Oracles.....	.125	.188		.375	.188	.125					
Inscriptions.....	.107	.429		.107	.036	.179		.036	.107		
Mathematical and medical lit.....	.129	.538		.136	.045	.091		.008	.053		
Rhetores, grammarians, scholia, lexica, etc.....	.067	.423		.209	.043	.108	.016	.049	.084	.002	
All the literature.....	.087	.405	.004	.219	.044	.139	.012	.023	.064	.002	

The total number of compounds, not including derivatives, for all the literature is 3058, while for the Sanskrit, Knauer gives only 1475, and for Latin, Vicol counts only 846 true compounds (including the mutata). As far then as the mere number of words is concerned, it is not true, as Froehde says, l. c. p. 214, that the use of the negative prefix is in Greek more limited than in the other languages which possess it.

15 per cent. of all the compounds given in the lexicon appear in the literature before 500 b. c. The Attic literature adds 26.8 per cent. and the Alexandrian 7 per cent., making a total of 48.8 per cent. before the Roman period. The Roman period, excluding ecclesiastical and technical literature, adds 12.9 per cent. and the Byzantine, ecclesiastical and technical literature 37.8 per cent. Uncertain are .5 per cent. It will be seen that, as in Latin, a very large proportion of the negative words belong to the post-classical period. Thus it would seem that the negative prefix was one of those elements of language, both in Greek and in Latin, which became much more productive as the making of the literature passed more and more into the hands of those who were not born to the traditions of the classical speech. Negative terms, for example, are quite prominent in the list of Greek words used by Cicero.

From Table I it may be seen that the only authors or groups of authors of the classical period in whose writings 100 or more of these negative words appear for the first time are: Homer, Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, Hippocrates, Plato, Aristotle. In the later language the new words appear very largely in the departments of medicine and philology. On the other hand the conservative vocabulary of the orators, with all the bulk of this department of the literature, furnishes only 87 new words altogether, and no one orator as many as 20 except Antiphon (22) and Demosthenes (20). The number in the latter case is to be explained as due largely to the great bulk of the extant orations. It is significant, however, that Antiphon furnishes the largest number of new negative words of any of the orators. The fact that he is the first of the orators may be off-set by the small bulk of his extant orations. But Antiphon's elevated style, the sternness of his subject, homicide, his religious, almost Aeschylean tone, his fondness for

antithesis and parallelism, the fullness of significance, which he is wont to compress into single words, all contribute to explain his proneness to employ the negative compounds and their derivatives, a proneness still more apparent after a glance at a few pages of his text. Cf. A. J. P., xvi, 525.

In the search for new words a proportionately larger number are of course to be expected in an earlier than in a later portion of the literature. It is clear, however, that the classical literature after Homer gained a very large proportion of its negative compounds from the poetic sphere of tragedy and the more or less technical works of Hippocrates, Plato and Aristotle. Very few new compounds are to be cited from the fourth century. In later Greek important accessions to the number of new words come from the Anthology, Cicero, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Diodorus, Lucian, and Cyril of Alexandria. Many are very late and are to be found only in Hesychius, Eustathius, Tzetzes and the Etymologicum Magnum; many are cited simply as ecclesiastical or Byzantine.

Table III gives the percentage of the whole number appearing in any author or group of authors which is formed by any one class. A glance at the first column in Table III shows that only a small proportion of the total number of negative words is formed by the compounds of prefix + adjective, especially in the classical language. Herodotus, Thucydides and Aristotle show a slight advance on the rest, while the proportion is lowest of all in the orators. It becomes larger again in late Greek.

Next in interest is a comparison of the second and fourth columns, classes *b* and *ef*. The great majority of the negative compounds in Homer are either verbal compounds of the type, *ἀδάμαστος*, or secondary possessives (mutata) of the type, *ἄφυλλος*. We observe relatively a quite steady advance of the later language beyond the earlier in the making of the *-τος* compounds and a still more striking falling off in the introduction of new mutata, compounds whose second member is a noun or a verbal stem. These changes are most noticeable in prose. Thus in Homer and early lyric poetry the mutata of class *ef* are the more numerous; but the relation is reversed in Hesiod, Aeschylus, Pindar and Bacchylides, while in the fragments of early philosophy, history and

comedy the shift is very much more marked. For the whole period before the fifth century the proportions are about equal. In tragedy after Aeschylus the mutata again predominate, also in the Ionic Herodotus and Hippocrates, but nowhere else within the range of the table except in the very poetic spheres of the Anthology and the Oracles. The mutata are slightly the more numerous in Alexandrian poetry (not shown in Table III, but see Table I). In comedy, Plato, Xenophon and Aristotle the *-τος* compounds predominate, and in Thucydides and the orators the percentages of mutata are away down to about the level of late Greek. In the fragments of philosophy (largely those attributed to Democritus) and in inscriptions the proportion of the mutata is lowest. The large use then of the mutata in preference to the verbals in *-τος* is most clearly poetic and perhaps, though of this we do not feel so certain, it is Ionic. Many of the mutata belong only to the higher ranges of literature and never gained currency in prose. It seems to have been distinctly an older habit of the language to coin a mutatum from a noun than to make a new verbal in *-τος* from the verb which corresponded to the noun. Yet as early as Homer we find a number of pairs like the following: *ἀπνρος*, *ἀπύρωτος*, *ἀτελής*, *ἀτέλεστος*, *ἄτιμος*, *ἄτιμητος*. The slight rise in the proportion of mutata in the philological literature is largely due to the citation of rare words in the lexica. In the later literature the list of *-τος* compounds is swelled by the numerous compounds with verbals having already a prepositional prefix. The solitary example in Homer is *ἀπροτίμαστος*; Hesiod adds *ἀνεπίξεστος* and *ἀνεπίρρεκτος*.

In the column containing the percentage of compounds of class *g* (as *ἀναιδό-μαχος* Bacchylides, etc.) the highest percentages are in Aeschylus, Pindar and Bacchylides, comedy, ecclesiastical and Byzantine writers, and most of all in the Oracles, which last speaks especially for the high poetic tone of these imposing compounds. Those in comedy may be credited to mere comic exuberance in word-formation or to parody and paratragedy, those in ecclesiastical and Byzantine writers to the general tendency of late Greek toward making common the loftier diction of earlier times.

The column headed *h* contains the percentages of the new derivative nouns, for the most part abstract. These next to the *-τος* compounds and the mutata are the most numerous of the negative words; see foot of Table III. Indeed, in the orators, Plato and Aristotle, and in much of the late prose they rank next to the *-τος* compounds and exceed the mutata in number. Disregarding the fragments of the lesser historians—the numbers are so small that the proportions may be only accidental—the highest percentage is Plato's; the percentages of Herodotus and Hippocrates follow close behind. The small number of new negative abstracts in Thucydides is noticeable, but then Thucydides could say *η οὐ διάλυσις*, etc.; cf. p. 31. The percentages are low in the poets. This may have some relation to the use of the neuter of adjectives as abstract nouns, which is more characteristic of the older language (Wil.-Moell. on Eur. H. F. 75). On the relation between the use of negative abstract nouns and the negative articular infinitive no trustworthy conclusion can be drawn from this table. For the orators the numbers of new negative abstracts are too small to afford any reliable basis for inference. Better results would doubtless be gained by studying the use of all the negative abstracts in the indices and texts of the Attic writers.

The derivative adverbs with the negative prefix, outside of those regularly formed in *-ως*, are mostly those in *-ι* (*-ει*) and are shown by the tables not to have been at all numerous, only 94 in all. Yet a few new ones appear in every period of the literature (see Tables I and II), notably 23 in good Attic, and 25 in the late grammarians and lexicographers.

The νη- compounds. Leaving out of account *νήπιος* and its derivatives as being doubtful in etymology, the compounds in *νη-* make their appearance in the literature as follows: Hom. 13, Hes. 5, lyric poets 2 + 2 doubtful, Pind. 2, Emped. 1, Soph. 1, Old Comedy 1, Com. Anon. 1, Hdt. 1, Hippocr. 1 + 1 doubtful, Andoc. 1, Alexandrian poetry 7, late Greek 13.

Of the 52 compounds and derivative words in *νη-* only 13 appear first in prose, and only one, *νηποιωεί* (Andoc., after Homeric *νήπιονος*), first in Attic prose. Considering the poetic and archaic sphere of these *νη-* compounds, the predominance of the mutata (*ef*) was to be expected. This is very marked in the Early and Attic literature but does not hold true for the later period.

	<i>a</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>ef</i>	<i>g</i>	<i>h</i>	<i>i</i>	<i>k</i>	<i>l</i>	Tot.
Early and Attic literature.....		3	14	2	7		1	5	32
Alexandrian and later literature...	1	7	4	1	4	1		2	20
Total	1	10	18	3	11	1	1	7	52

LIFE.

Hollister Adelbert Hamilton was born in Wayne Co., New York, Jan. 14, 1870. His preliminary education was received in the public schools of Rochester, New York. In the autumn of 1888 he entered the University of Rochester from which he was graduated with the degree of A. B. in June, 1892. He takes this opportunity of expressing his sense of indebtedness to the instruction in the classics and to personal influence of Professors Geo. M. Forbes and H. F. Burton. During the years 1892-94 he was vice-principal of the high school at Waterloo, New York, and during the years 1894-96 he was instructor in Latin and Greek at the University of Rochester. During the years 1896-99 he was a graduate student at the Johns Hopkins University, making Greek his principal and Latin and Sanskrit his subordinate subjects. Here he was successively appointed university scholar and fellow in Greek, and in 1899 he received the degree of doctor of philosophy. He attended the lectures of Professors Gildersleeve, Warren, Bloomfield, K. F. Smith and Miller, to all of whom he desires to make grateful acknowledgment, and especially to Professor Gildersleeve, who by his kindly interest, by the inspiration of his teaching and by the influence of his own personality has imposed a debt of lasting gratitude.





